

JOURNAL
OF THE
BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
(New Series)

EDITED BY

DR. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, M.A., PH.D. (Berlin)

A. A. A. FYZEE, M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law

PROF. N. K. BHAGWAT, M.A.

33187

VOLUME 14
1938

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY
SEPTEMBER 1938

LONDON AGENT:
ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C. 1.

33187

B

TABLE OF CONTENTS


NEW SERIES, VOL. 14, 1938.

ARTICLES

	Page
Rgvedic Similes. By H. D. VELANKAR	1
Tombs of Some Persian Ismaili Imams. By W. IVANOW ..	49
An Ismaili Poem in Praise of Fidawis. By W. IVANOW ..	63
The Tirayars in Mohenjo Daro. By The REV. FR. H. HERAS, S.J.	73

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

<i>Nizamu'l-Mulk Asaf Jah I.</i> By AZEEM TYABJI ..	79
<i>The Mandaecans of Iraq and Iran.</i> By W. IVANOW ..	80
<i>The Types of Sanskrit Drama.</i> By V. A. GADGIL ..	82
<i>Brahmavidyā: vol. I, pt. I (17-2-37).</i> By H. D. VELANKAR	83
<i>Śrī Haima-līṅgānuśāsana of Kalikāla-sarvajña Hemacandra.</i> By H. D. VELANKAR	84
<i>Tatvabindu of Vacaspati.</i> By H. D. VELANKAR ..	84
<i>Śrī Praśastisaṃgraha.</i> By H. D. VELANKAR ..	85
<i>India: A Short Cultural History.</i> By B. G. MURDESHWAR	85
<i>Historical Selection from Baroda State Records</i> ..	86
<i>Persian Sources of Indian History</i>	86
<i>Sivakaleen Patra Sāra Saṅgraha</i>	86
<i>The Vaishnavas of Gujerat</i>	87
<i>Hindu Mysticism according to the Upaniṣads.</i> By V. A. GADGIL	87
<i>Suvarṇabhāṣottama-Sūtra.</i> By P. V. BAPAT ..	89
<i>Dharmakośa.</i> By V. S. SUKTHANKAR	93



JOURNAL
OF THE
BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

VOL. 14

1938

ṚGVEDIC SIMILES

I. SIMILES OF THE VĀMADEVAS (R. V. MANDALA IV.)

(Translated into English and annotated)

By H. D. VELANKAR.

INTRODUCTION.

1. In the following article, I propose to examine the similes of the Vāmadevas from a rhetorical point of view. My idea in doing it is to see if it is possible to go nearer to the true meaning of the Ṛgvedic stanzas by approaching them through their rhetorical side. I am aware that in doing so, we cannot afford to neglect the earlier methods of Ṛgvedic interpretation, i.e. (1) the Traditional one which is based on the assumption that the main purpose of the Ṛgveda is usefulness at sacrifices and (2) the Linguistic one which proposes to take into account only the language of the hymns clarified with the help of philological and mythological comparisons with other Indo-European Literatures. Both these methods, whether employed singly or conjointly, however, seem to me to neglect an important factor which must have worked in the composition of the Ṛgvedic hymns. It is something different from the PURPOSE for which they were composed and also different from the mere LANGUAGE which was necessary for conveying the ideas in the poet's mind. Both these are objective factors and certainly cannot be neglected. But equally important is also the COMPOSITIONAL ART which the poet has brought to bear upon his work. The poet's MODE of expressing a particular idea must also be understood before the real meaning of his words is rightly comprehended. The ideas at the back of the poet's mind can be clear to

us only by the combined study of his prupose, language, and poetic art.

2. The art of a poet is both conscious and unconscious. We must study both; but it is easier to study the former and there I propose to make a beginning. That the Rgvedic poets were conscious of their art is I think sufficiently demonstrable. I shall quote only one important passage, and it is RV. VII. 32. 13ab (Mantram akharvañ sudhitañ supeśasam dadhāta yajñīyeṣu ā). It requires a hymn to be not too short, well arranged (probably metrical accuracy is meant) and well decorated (evidently figures of speech are intended). The usual adjective of a hymn, i.e. *nava* or *navyas* is also significant and indicates beyond doubt the poet's desire to show his individual skill in his art.

3. The most important part of the conscious art of the Rgvedic poets is the use of figures of speech. The earliest and most prominent among these are naturally the Upamā, the Utprekṣā, the Rūpaka, and the Atīṣayokti. The Śabdālankāras of an intricate nature are on the whole rare in the Rvgeda. But words are put to use in various ways for producing resonance and other kinds of sound effect and there can be no doubt that this was intentionally done. Thus we find (1) repetition¹ of a noun, an adjective or a verb

¹ देवासो देवं 1. 1; अनन्ते अन्तः 1. 7; शुचिः शुक्रः 1. 7; ऋतस्य बोधि ऋतचित् 3. 4; रक्षणेभी ररक्षणः 3. 14; कवये काव्यानि 3. 16; महि महां 5. 9; देवयन्तो देवं 11. 5; प्रतारि अग्ने प्रतरं 12. 6; देवो देवेषु 15. 1; मघानि मघवा 17. 8; जनीयन्तो जनिदां 17. 16; पिता पितृतमः पितृणां 17. 17; विद्वानाह विदुषे 19. 10; शमी शशमानस्य 22. 8; सहुरे सहांसि 22. 9; सख्यं सखिभ्यः 23. 6; तेतिक्ते तिग्मा 23. 7; ऋणा चिदत्र ऋणयाः 23. 7; ऋतेन ऋतं 23. 9; पचात्पक्तीः 24. 7; नरे नर्याय नृतमाय नृणां 25. 4; विभ्यो विः; इयेनेभ्यः इयेनः 26. 4; मूरा अमूरः 26. 7; पतत्पतत्रि 27. 4; महान्महीभिः 32. 1; चित्रश्चित्रिणीष्वा चित्रं 32. 2; सोमानां सोमपाः 32. 14; भूरिदा भूरि देहि नो 32. 20; वाजे वाजिन्तमं 37. 5; तुरं यतीषु तुरयन् 38. 7; सखाया सख्याय 41. 3; बृहन्ता बृहतीभिः 41. 11; विश्वायोर्विश्वे 42. 1; ऋतेन ऋतावा 42. 4; मध्वा माध्वी मधु 43. 5; मन्दिनो मन्दिनिसृशः 44. 4; सोमपा सोमपीतये 49. 3; रेवतीः रेवत् 51. 4; शुभं यत् शुभ्राः 51. 6; समानतः समना 51. 8; समना समानीः 51. 9; सवितः सवाय 54. 5; सवितः सवासः 54. 6; पात् पतिः 55. 5; देवी देवेभिः यजते यजत्रैः 56. 2; अञ्जि अञ्जानाः 58. 9.

with different forms in succession; (2) employment¹ of words with similar endings; (3) employment² of words with similar resonant beginnings; (4) promiscuous³ repetition of syllables; (5) repetition⁴ of a word at the beginning of each line or even in the middle of it for the sake of emphasis; (6) repetition⁵ of the same word at

¹ ऋज्वच्चः खच्चः 6. 9; आनुषग्जुजोषत् 4. 10; भरिषो गविषः; द्रवरः पतंगरः 40. 2; वृषद्वरसद्व्योमसत्; अब्जा गोजा ऋतजा अद्रिजाः 40. 5; वृकतिर्दभीतिः 41. 4.

² सुकमीणः सुरचः 2. 17; चारु चक्षुः 2. 19; स्वध्वः सुहिरण्यः 4. 10; अतन्द्रासो अवृका अश्रमिष्ठाः 4. 12; उपस्तभायदुपमित 5. 1; सुधितः सुमेकः 6. 3; आरे अस्मदमतिसारे अंहः 11. 6; द्रप्सं दविध्वत् 13. 2; अनायतो अनिवद्धः 13. 5; सुषुमा सुदक्षं 16. 1; वधीदृत्रं वज्रेण 17. 3; विष्णो वितरं विक्रमस्व 18. 11; गौरस्य गवयस्य गोहे 21. 8; सत्रा सहुरे सहांसि 22. 9; तेतिके तिग्मा तुजसे 23. 7; दीना दक्षा विदुहन्ति 24. 9; ददहाणो देवावान्दिवः 26. 6; अहन्नहिमरिणात् 28. 1; मघवन्मन्यु-मत्तमः 30. 7; मदानां मंहिष्ठो मत्सत् 31. 2; स्ववसः स्वपसः सुहस्ताः 33. 8; चक्र चमसं चतुर्वयं निश्चर्मणः 36. 4; सखाया सख्याय स्तोमैः सुतेभिः सुप्रयसा 41. 3; पुरतमं पुरस्तात् 51. 1; समुद्रं न संचरणे सनिध्यवः 55. 6; सम्यक्स्ववन्ति सरितो 58. 6.

³ त 2. 13 ab; द 7. 8 cd; स and न 10. 8 cd; व 13. 4; 25. 2b; 30. 2b; 36. 5 cd; स 43. 7b; प 58. 7 ab; and म 58. 11 d.

⁴ कदा 3. 4; कः 3. 5-7; 25. 1-3; 43. 1-2; मा 3. 12; अस्माकं 9. 7; लत् 11. 3-4; अस्मत् 22. 10; ऋतस्य 23. 8-10; आदित् 24. 5; इन्द्रं 25. 8; प्रियः 25. 5; न 25. 6; अहं 26. 1-2; न-नकिः 30. 1; वामं 30. 24; अस्मात् 31. 10; भूरि 32. 20; यत्सवत्सं 33. 4; सजोषाः 34. 7-8; ये 34. 9; सं 34. 11; शच्या 35. 5; इह 36. 9; सः 37. 6; मधु 45. 3; उत 52. 3; त्रिः-तिस्रः 53. 5; वि (prepo.) 55. 2; मधुमत् 57. 3.

⁵ कथा 3. 7-8; 23. 3-5; ऋतेन 3. 9-11; सः 8. 2-4; 9. 2-3; वेषि 9. 5-6; त्वा युजा 28. 1-2; यत्र 30. 4-6; उत 30.

the beginning of two or more consecutive stanzas; (7) repetition¹ of a group of words from the preceding in the following stanza; (8) employment² of words implying a sharp contrast and (9) abundant use of purely expletive particles³ for syntactical ornamentation. Compare also the employment of different expressions to convey the same idea, at 17.2. The Śleṣa, both of Śabda and Artha, is generally rare. The latter perhaps may be found employed in a restricted sphere; e.g. in maintaining an artificial⁴ concord between the Upameya and the Upamāna. But this cannot be regarded as very intentional. I mean that it is not primarily employed by the poet for the sake of its own beauty, but it is evidently forced upon him by the consideration of maintaining the concord. On the other hand, the Śleṣa of Śabda, where a common word is used in two entirely disconnected senses, is I believe entirely absent in R̥gvedic poetry.⁵

12-18; 38. 5-9; 40. 3-4; अथा 2. 14-16; तातूमे 22. 5-6; अस्मान् 31. 10-12; अस्माकं 31. 14-15; अहं 42. 2-4; इन्द्रा 41. 1-5.

¹ वेरध्वरः 7. 7-8; सद्यो जातः 7. 9-10; ऋतुर्भद्रः 10. 1-2; विश्वा अथिथा इन्द्र कृष्टीः 17. 6-7; आदिज्ञेमे 24. 4-5; आदाय 26. 6-7; ले सत्ता 32. 3-4. Also cf. 42. 1-2; 48. 1-4.

² आमा-पक्कं 3. 9b; कृष्णा-दशता 3. 9c; घोरस्य-चारुः 6. 6b; वक्ता अशुवः—ऋतज्ञाः युवतीः 19. 7 ab; धन्वानि-अजान्; स्तर्यः—दंसुपत्नीः 19. 7 cd; विररप्यो नवेभिः—अभिमन्यमानो विवक्मि 20. 5 (See Nos. 10, 68, 69); सुध्वेः—असुध्वेः 25. 6; परे-अवरे-मध्य-मासः; यान्तो-वसितासः; क्षियन्तः—युध्यमानाः 25. 8.

³ See Index of the Padas; thus the following are used by the Vāmadevas:—

अथ (20 times); इत् (59 times); उ (33 times); कं (only once); घ (8 times); सु (13 times); स्म (14 times); खित् (4 times); ह (24 times) and हि (33 times).

⁴ Compare Bergaigne, Syntax of Vedic Comparisons, translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah in Annals B.O.R.I., Vol. 16 (34-35), p. 242ff.

⁵ Compare however my note on No. 39 below.

4. Among the four Arthālahkāras mentioned above, Rūpaka¹ and Atiśayokti² generally occur in the limited sphere of the epithets of a deity; see notes on Nos. 8 and 20. Utprekṣā was no doubt known to the Rgvedic poets, but it is often very difficult to distinguish it from Upamā. The occurrence of *Iva* after words like *adhi* (VII. 7. 14), *api* (VII. 18. 6), *iha* (I. 37. 3), *Uta* (I. 173. 3), or *yathā* (X. 86. 7), or after (the only) verbal forms like *gātṛyanti* (I. 169. 5) and *vāsayasī* (VII. 37. 6) leaves no doubt that *Iva* was sometimes used to express a Saṁbhāvanā. In cases where *Iva* or *Na* occur after an inflected noun or adjective, it is the poet's intention alone indicated by the general context or by words like $\sqrt{\text{man}}$ or $\sqrt{\text{kāś}}$, which shows whether a simile or an Utprekṣā is meant. Generally, however, it is advisable to look for an Utprekṣā only when Upamā is rendered impossible.³

5. The Vedic Upamā is usually a simple affair. It has its four parts, i.e. the Upameya, the Upamāna, the particle of comparison and the Common term or the words expressive of the common property. All the four are generally expressed by the poet, but examples of a Luptopamā where the common term is dropped are sometimes found; cf. Nos. 51, 80, 87, and 136. On the other hand, instances of a compound Upamā, which is an Upamā with one principal and one or more subsidiary Upamānas, where one of the Upameyas or the Upamānas is dropped, are more numerous. I have given the name 'Ekadeśavivartini Sāṅga' to such Upamās and have collected them under a separate group; cf. Nos. 28-41. I have also separately noticed an interesting variety of a simple Upamā, which contains a qualified Upamāna; cf. Nos. 42-91. In these, the attributives of the Upamāna belong exclusively to it

¹ Cf. वृषा अग्निः 3. 10; 5. 3, etc; एनसः ऊर्वात् 12. 5; वृषा इन्द्रः 16. 3, etc; तनूः हिरण्यं 10. 6; वाजी अग्निः 15. 1; वृतस्य नाम— देवानां जिह्वा (but is it not Loc.? Cf. AV. VII. 29. 2d).

² मही रशना (स्तुति) 1. 9; चारु चक्षुः (तेजः) 2. 19; ससस्य पृथ्वेः (मेघस्य स्वपतः) चर्मन् 5. 7; द्विः पञ्च स्वसारः (अङ्गुलयः) 6. 8; अर्वा (अग्निः) 7. 11 d; रथं (स्तोत्रं) 16. 20; गृष्टिः (अदितिः) 18. 10; वृषमन्-वत्सं (इन्द्रं) 18. 10; महिषं (इन्द्रं) 18. 11; अद्रयः (आपः Cf. No. 36) 19. 5; अयुवः— युवतीः स्तर्यः-दंसुपत्नीः (नद्यः) 19. 7; वज्रं (वज्रं Cf. No. 20) 20. 6; अश्मानं (वज्रं) 22. 1, etc. वृतस्य धाराः (स्तुतयः) 58. 5-6.

³ See for example Nos. 71, 93, 103, 107, 109 and 117.

and the Upameya has nothing corresponding to the same. This attributive has generally the form of an adjective in the same case with the Upamāna and produces a sort of music with the particle of comparison standing between the Upamāna and this adjective. It may indeed come either before or after the Upamāna. It will be seen that in the Vedic Upamās only particles like *Na*, *Iva*, and *Yathā* (only once in Maṇḍala IV, i.e. 12. 6) are used to express similarity. Adjectives like *tulya*, *Sadṛśa*, etc. either separately or in a compound with the Upamāna, the Upameya or both are not yet employed. Thus we have no Ārthī Upamās in the Ṛgveda, at least in the IVth Maṇḍala. Of the Samāsagās, we have only the doubtful variety where *iva* is used and is compounded with the Upamāna, or its adjective (cf. Nos. 85, 87, 88), or a word connected with it (cf. No. 92). Similarly the Tadhitaḡā is very rare; I have noticed only a few examples in the IVth Maṇḍala. The word Manuṣvat is used twice, but in the former case (IV. 34. 3) it is Śrauti, while in the latter (IV. 37. 3) it is Ārthī. Nṛvat also occurs twice: IV. 22. 4 and 55. 4. The first is Ārthī Upamā.

6. As regards the SYNTAX of the Vedic Upamās, the following points deserve notice:—(1) the concord between the Upamāna and the Upameya; (2) the concord between the Upamāna and the Upameya on the one hand and the common term on the other; (3) the separateness between the Upamāna, the Upameya, and the common term; (4) the order of words constituting these three, and lastly (5) the choice of a particle of comparison. All these are generally determined by the expressional convention and convenience of the poet, and only rarely by the consideration of Art. It must at the same time be admitted that the line of demarcation between the considerations of convenience and art is only faint. The break of convention which we are inclined to ascribe to convenience, may be really due to the poet's expressional Art and vice versa. I therefore note below the general convention of the Vāmadevas as well as its break in respect of these five points mentioned above, leaving the reader to judge whether the latter is due to convenience or Art.

7. The concord between the Upamāna and the Upameya in respect of number and gender is only *unconsciously* maintained (1) and hence it is very often broken. The change in the common term (2) however is not always necessary even when the number and gender of the Upamāna are different from those of the Upameya. We are of course here concerned with the principal Upamāna and the principal Upameya, because these alone are directly connected with the common term. This is usually true of those (principal) Upamānas and Upameyas (a) which are in the oblique¹ cases, or (b) even of those which are in the nominative case and differ only in gender but not in number, the common property being expressed

¹ Compare Nos. 23, 44, 45, 49, 61, 62, 65, 86, 97, 108, 113, 128, 140, and 145.

by a finite verb.¹ On the other hand, (c) when they are in the nominative case and differ in respect of number and have a finite verb² for a common term, or (d) when they are in the nominative case, differ either in number or in gender or in both and have an adjective³ for a common term, (e) or when the principal upameya is a pronoun⁴ of the 1st or the 2nd person, a change becomes necessary and the common term agrees as a rule with the Upameya. This is perfectly natural since the object of the poet's description is the Upameya alone and the Upamāna is introduced only for exalting the Upameya. Only in extremely rare cases, it agrees with the Upamāna; cf. Nos. 42, 83, and 87 (perhaps also No. 44, if we take prthvi as the common term).

8. The separateness of the Upameya, the Upamāna, and the common term is generally well maintained in the simple Upamās, but their interfusion is sometimes seen owing to metrical or other considerations. Thus a preposition is separated from its verb which expresses the common term by the Upameya, the Upamāna or both; cf. Nos. 39; 67; 68; 89; 99 and 130. But sometimes even a group of nouns and verbs together expressing the common property is similarly split up to make room for the Upamāna or the Upameya; cf. No. 110. The cases of such interfusion are, however, naturally more numerous in the compound Upamās, which contain one principal and one or more subsidiary Upamānas. Thus in No. 2, the common term 'cakṛma' is emboxed between the two Upameyas 'vayam' and 'tanūbhiḥ'; in No. 4, the two Upamānas and the common term find themselves between the two Upameyas 'tam' and 'ohaiḥ'; in No. 6, the common term 'sādhān' is interposed between the two Upameyas 'vṛṣā' and 'vidathāni'; in No. 7, the subsidiary Upameya 'puraḥ' is between the two Upamānas 'atkam' and 'jarimā'; in No. 9, both the Upamānas 'vār' and 'vātaḥ' are between the two Upameyas 'kṣāma' and 'Indraḥ'; in No. 12, the common term and the two Upamānas are between the two Upameyas 'śaktiḥ' and 'tuyyojasam (putram)'; in No. 17, the common term 'sadhryak yanti' is broken up to make room for the two Upamānas and one Upameya; in No. 20, the Upamānas are emboxed within the two Upameyas 'vajram' and 'vasunā', probably due to the employment of another simile 'sthaviram na' which also is similarly emboxed; in No. 22, the common term 'abhipitve ahnām agman' is split up to make room for the two Upamānas; in No. 33, the common term 'jūtaḥ' is placed between the two Upamānas 'vātaḥ' and 'abhrāḥ'; lastly, in No. 40, the two Upamānas, one expressed and the other suggested, find themselves between the two Upameyas 'agniḥ' and 'dhūmam' and this is due to the presence of

¹ Compare Nos. 12, 17, 36, 80, 89, 90, 92, 133, 134.

² Compare Nos. 43, 83, 99, 143.

³ Compare Nos. 28, 55, 58, 79, 85, 136.

⁴ Compare Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, 57, 106, 137, and 143.

the other simile (i.e. No. 98) which immediately precedes the present one.

9. The order in which the chief and the subsidiary Upamānas are stated is guided by the order of the chief and subsidiary Upameyas except where the metrical or some other considerations decide otherwise; compare for example, Nos. 6, 8, 9, 13, 23, and 39. The order of the Upamāna and its attributives in a simple Upamā, however, does not appear to depend upon that of the Upameya and its attributives. It solely depends upon the expressional convenience of the poet. But the inversion of the usual order of words known as Hyperbaton may sometimes be attributed to some psychological reason; see below, No. 110.

10. More interesting and instructive are, however, the results yielded by my researches into the selection of a particle of comparison by the poet. Very probably, of course, this selection was done unconsciously and was generally dictated by the ease of pronunciation and sheer habit. Nevertheless, a few rules of a general application may be deduced from the poets' practice in this matter. They are as follows:—Mainly, the choice of a particle of comparison is governed by the nature of the ending of the Upamāna. Thus (I) a clear preference for *Na* is shown when the Upamāna ends (*a*) in AM of the accusative¹, preceded by a short vowel, i.e. *a*, *i* or *u*, or (*b*) in a Visarga² also preceded by a short vowel, i.e. *a*, *i* or *u*. (II) on the other hand, a preference is shown for *Iva* (*a*) when it ends in a Visarga³ which is preceded by a long vowel, or (*b*) when it ends in *a*⁴, *ā*, *i*, *ī*.

SIMILES OF THE VĀMADEVAS

(RV. Maṇḍala IV.)

The similes are arranged under four groups, the first and the last two of which have two subdivisions each. The groups are as follows:—I (*a*) fully expressed compound similes with *na*:—Nos. 1–17; (*b*) fully expressed compound similes with *iva*:—Nos. 18–27. II Partially expressed compound similes with *na* or *iva*: Nos. 28–41. III (*a*) Simple similes with a qualified or compound upamāna, with *na*:—Nos. 42–83; (*b*) simple similes with a qualified upamāna, with *iva*:—Nos. 84–93. IV (*a*) Simple similes with a simple upamāna with *iva*:—Nos. 94–128; (*b*) simple similes with a simple

¹ Compare Nos. 1, 2, 4, 7, 13, 15, 38, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 132, 139, 142, and 145. Exceptions are Nos. 103, 113, 118, 119, and 128.

² Compare Nos. 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 47, 48, 51, 52, 54, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 76, 78, 82, 83, 129, 131, 133, 134, 136, 137, 143, and 144. Exceptions are Nos. 21, 22, 24, 26 and 123.

³ Compare Nos. 23, 81, 90, 91, 92, 93, 101, 104, 105, 116, 124; exceptions are Nos. 50 and 130.

⁴ Compare Nos. 18, 19, 20, 25, 27, 40, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 117, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127; exceptions are Nos. 43 and 141.

upamāna with *na*:—Nos. 129–145. For the relation between the original passages and the numbers given to them by us, see Index given at the end.

GROUP I.—FULLY EXPRESSED COMPOUND SIMILES.

Under this group, I have put together all Sāṅga Samastavastuviṣaya Upamāns. Such similes contain one principal and one or more subordinate upamānas and upameyas all of which are expressly mentioned by the poet. In such similes, one thing with its parts or subsidiaries is compared with another with its parts or subsidiaries and though there are thus two or more upamānas and upameyas, yet there is only one common property. These similes appear to show a preference for the particle *na*, except when the other i.e. *iva* is recommended by the ending of the Upamāna or by the Metre. The particle of comparison, whether *na* or *iva*, finds a place between the principal and the subordinate upamānas, except where this position is metrically impossible, or when the principal upamāna consists of two words. In the latter case, it is placed between the two words which constitute the upamāna; cf. Nos. 2, 5, 13 and 34.

(a) Fully expressed similes with *na*.

(1) सखे सखायमभ्याववृत्स्वाशुं न चक्रं [रथ्येव रंहा] ।

IV. 1. 3ab.

‘Oh friend (Agni), follow the friend (Varuṇa), as the wheel follows the swift horse, [and as swift horses follow (riches) fit to be carried away in chariots].’

In both the similes, ‘abhyāvavṛtsva’ expresses the common property. The principal upameya ‘tvam’ and the subsidiary upameya ‘sakhāyam’ are first compared with ‘cakram and āsum’ and then with ‘raṁhyā’ and ‘rathyā’ respectively. The words used for the upameyas and the upamānas are very suggestive. Thus the word ‘sakhā’ in the upameyas suggests ‘faithfulness and eagerness’ (‘follow Varuṇa *eagerly* and *faithfully* as a friend follows a friend.’). Similarly, the upamānas ‘cakram’ and ‘raṁhyā’ used for ‘tvam’ suggests ‘faithfulness and absolute dependance’ on the one hand and ‘eagerness and active following’ on the other. Agni should follow Varuṇa, not merely in the way of ‘a wheel following (even) a swift horse i.e. with passive and absolute faithfulness’, but also in the manner of ‘the swift horses following the cartful (riches), i.e. with eagerness and of one’s own initiative’. The upamānas ‘āsum’ and ‘rathyā’ used for ‘sakhāyam’ suggest, in the same manner, ‘the unapproachability and yet covetability’ of Varuṇa. Varuṇa is unapproachable like a swift horse, yet he is covetable like the cart-laden (riches) of the enemy’.

‘Rathyā’ is ‘rathyā vasūni’ as in X. 102. 11c (eṣaiṣyā cid rathyā Jayema —‘May we conquer (riches) which are to be eagerly coveted and which are fit to be carried away in chariots.’) Raṁhyā are ‘swift horses’ (two), the same as ‘āsū’ or ‘raghū’; for the idea of the ‘conquering’ horses running after enemy’s riches, cf. IX. 100. 4 (Dhārā sutasya dhāvati; Raṁhamānā-vāram vājiva sānasih); IV. 5. 13 (vāmaṁ acchā gamema raghavo na vājam).

(2) अथा ह यद्वयममे लाया पृथ्विर्हस्तेमिश्चक्रमा तुनूभिः ।

रथं न क्रन्तो अपसा भुरिजोऽकृतं यैमुः सुध्य आशुषाणाः ॥

IV. 2. 14.

‘And oh Agni, whatever we do with our hands and feet and bodies through devotion to you, as those who prepare a chariot do with the work of their arms, (in all that), the wise (i.e. the Ṇgirasas) have followed (lit. controlled) the Rta, while strengthening it.’

The poet here identifies the *Āngirasas* with himself and his followers, while in the next stanza he reverses the process and identifies himself and his followers with the *Āngirasas*. He thus requests Agni to note that whatever the *Vānadevas* do to serve him is directed by the *Āngirasas* themselves; Supply 'tasmin' and 'Āngiraso' in *d* to complete the sense. 'Ratham krantah' is the principal upamāna and 'bhurijoh apasā' is the subordinate one, corresponding to 'vayam' and 'padbhiḥ, hastebhiḥ, tanūbhiḥ', the principal and the subordinate upameyas resp. 'Cakṛina' expresses the common property.

The position of 'Na' calls for a remark. It should have come after 'krantah' i.e. between the principal and the subsidiary upamānas; but since the principal upamāna itself consists of two words, the 'Na' finds a place between these two words. Also, cf. Nos. 5, 13 and 34. Perhaps, the desire to avoid a hiatus (Na apasā) also must have helped in deciding the position of 'Na' in the present case.

(3) कद्धं वामसच्छां गमेम रघवो न वार्जम् ।

IV. 5. 13b.

'Towards which riches shall we go as the swift horses go towards the prize?'

'Raghavo' and 'vājam' are the principal and subsidiary upamānas, corresponding to 'vayam' and 'vāmam'. 'Acchā gamema' expresses the common property.

(4) अग्ने तमुद्याश्च न स्तोमैः कर्तुं न भद्रं हृदिस्पृशम् ।

ऋध्यामां तु ओदैः ॥

IV. 10. 1.

'Let us glorify that (sacrifice) of yours which rests in your heart like auspicious wisdom with invocations to you as (we cheer up) a horse with encouraging words.'

We supply 'yagñam' after 'tam' in *a*. 'Āsvam' and 'stomaiḥ' are the two upamānas corresponding to the principal and subsidiary upameyas 'tam (yajñam)' and 'ohaiḥ' respectively. 'Rdhyāma' expresses the common property. For the simile, cf. IV. 3. 12e; VIII. 103. 7a; III. 2. 3d and I. 138. 2a. The constant comparison of Agni with a horse and the very similar passage VIII. 103. 7a would have made Sāyana's construction of *tam* as referring to Agni himself more probable. But the comparison of *tam* with Bhadrām kratum in the same stanza renders this impossible. For Agni is said to be possessed of Bhadrā kratu in the next stanza; hence in the present stanza too, the thing that is compared with Bhadrā kratu must be another thing possessed by Agni and it is the 'yajñam'.

(5) ऊर्ध्वं भानुं सञ्चिता देवो अश्रेष्ठसं दर्विध्वद्रविषो न सत्त्वा ॥

IV. 13. 2ab.

'The divine Savitā has sent aloft his light as a warrior eager for loot does his banner after brandishing it.'

'Savitā' and 'bhānum', the principal and subsidiary upameyas are respectively compared with 'gaviṣo satvā' and 'drapsam'. 'Urdhvam aśret' expresses the common property. Compare remarks under No. (2) for the position of 'na'.

The meaning of 'drapsa' is doubtful. It means 'banner' according to Roth and 'a mass of dust' acc. to Sāyana. Should we connect the word

with 'drāpi' and take it to mean 'a shield'? 'Davidhvat' would not certainly present a difficulty (brandishing a shield) and I. 64. 2d ('Satvāno na drapsino ghoravarpasah) where the Maruts are compared with 'shielded warriors' in respect of a fearful appearance, only favours the rendering. I do not believe *drapsino* is to be construed as the common term as Grass., WB., p. 644 and Geldner, Trans. p. 76 do. A śleṣa on the word was probably never intended by the poet; for if we take it as such, it will be a śabdaśleṣa only since there is nothing common to *drapsa* 'the banner' and *drapsa* 'the drop.' And such a śabdaśleṣa is probably too early for Rgvedic Poetry; yet see below No. 39.

Perhaps 'ūrdhvam' is to be construed as an adj. of the upameya and not as a part of the common term; cf. IV. 6. 2c; X. 3. 2c; III. 61. 5c (ūrdhvam pājah). In this case, translate:—'Savitā has put on his uprising light as a warrior takes up his shield after brandishing it'. In this latter case, *aśret* alone would be the common term.

(6) कविर्न निष्यं विदधानि साधुन्वृषा यत्सेकं विषिपानो अर्चात् ।

IV. 16. 3ab.

'When the Bull (Indra) may sing after drinking the poured out juice helping the sacred rites as does the poet (Uśanā or Agni?) the secret formulæ.'

Kavi is probably Agni who is fond of secret formulæ (Niṣyā Vacāmsi cf. IV. 3. 16b); or perhaps kavi is 'Uśanā' mentioned in the last stanza i.e. IV. 16. 2. I prefer the first. 'Kaviḥ' and 'niṣyam' are employed as the upamānas resp. for the principal and subsidiary upameyas 'vr̥ṣā' and 'vidatāni'.

(7) पञ्चाशत्कृष्णा निर्वपः सहस्रात्कं न पुरो जरिमा विददः ।

IV. 16. 13cd.

'You laid low fifty thousand blacks; you battered down their forts (as easily) as old age (destroys) a garment.'

'Tvam' and 'purah', the principal and the subsidiary upameyas are resp. compared with 'jarimā' and 'atkam'; 'vi dardah' expresses the common property.

The position of 'purah', the subsidiary upameya, in the middle of the simile (i.e. atkam na jarimā) is very interesting. The poet evidently desires to emphasize the first part of the simile and wants to convey vividly 'the ease and lightness' with which Indra carried out his work of destruction. He therefore uses the words 'atkam na purah' together, and then completes his simile by employing an upamāna i.e. 'Jarimā' for 'Indra' (or rather 'Tvam'). But in addition to this psychological reason, considerations of metre (awkward rhythm and a late caesura) also might have been responsible for the position of 'purah'.

(8) एवेदिन्द्राय वृषमाय वृष्णे ब्रह्माकर्षं भृगवो न रथम् ।

IV. 16. 20 ab.

'Thus have we prepared a hymn, as the Bhṛguṣ prepared a chariot (i.e. a hymn) for the mighty Bull, Indra.'

Older scholars proposed to read 'Rbhavo' for 'Bhṛgavo', but this would not mend matters in our passage, since the Rbhus fashioned a chariot for the Aśvinā and not for Indra; cf. IV. 36. 1-2. Besides, the same expression occurs again at X. 39. 14b (where indeed the emendation would look tempting)

and a similar feat (i.e. that of fashioning a chariot for Indra) is also ascribed to Anus at V. 31. 4a as is shown by Oldenburg, *Noten*, I. p. 278. I believe, in all the three passages including the present one, we have to do with an early example of a Vedic *atiśayokti* (gradually extended from the attributes of a deity such as Vṛṣā or Vṛṣabha, to other things belonging to it), rather than with an actual fashioning of a chariot by the Bhṛgu or the Anus; compare the very similar case of the word *niyut*. A hymn is often compared with a vehicle; here it is identified with it. We may perhaps translate:—‘We have prepared a hymn, a chariot, for Indra, etc., like the Bhṛgu.’ This however, would make the upamā, a *Nirāṅga* one. As it is, ‘Vayam’ and ‘brahman’ are respectively compared with ‘Bhṛgavo’ and ‘ratham’, and ‘ak-arma’ expresses the common property.

(9) अक्षौदयच्छवसा क्षमं वृध्रे वार्णं वातस्तविषीभिरेन्द्रः ॥

IV. 19. 4ab.

‘Indra smashed the earth and the mid-air with his might and powers as the wind the water (cloud).’

The principal and subsidiary upamānas are ‘vāta’ and ‘vār’ corresponding to ‘Indra’ and ‘kṣāma, budhnam’ and ‘akṣodayat’ is the common term.

(10) मर्यो न योषामभिमच्यमानोच्छा विवक्त्रिमिन्द्रम् ॥

IV. 20. 5cd.

‘Being sure of success, [abhimanyamāno] I call upon Indra, the oft invited one, as a man (lover) calls upon his beloved.’

‘Maryaḥ’ and ‘yoṣām’ are the principal and subsidiary upamānas corresponding to ‘aham’ and ‘Indram’, while ‘abhimanyamāno aceha vivakmi’ expresses the common property. The same compound simile occurs in two other passages of the Rgveda i.e. I. 115. 2b and IX. 93. 2c. In both these, ‘yoṣā’ is used as an upamāna for a female (once for uṣā and once for ‘āpaḥ’); she evidently allures the ‘Marya’ and has a power over him. But in the present passage, she stands as an upamāna for Indra and is apparently under the sway of her ‘Marya’, may be the sway of affection; ‘abhimanyamāno’ is characteristic of Vāmadeva and is quite in keeping with the sentiment of the first half of the stanza; see below Nos. 68, 69.

(11) तविषीर्यसं पूर्वौद्यौर्न क्षत्रमुभिभूति पुष्यात् ॥

IV. 21. 1cd.

‘Who should develop his many powers, as Dyauh (nurses) his overpowering might.’

‘Yah’ taken out from ‘yasya’ which is merely a reflexive pronoun here, is intended to be the subject of ‘puṣyāt’, as accent of the latter shows. ‘Indra’ with his ‘taviṣis’ is compared to ‘Dyauh’ with his ‘abhibhūti kṣatram’.

(12) आ त्वा शमी शशमानस्य शक्तिः ।

अस्मद्वक् शशुचानस्य यम्या आशुर्न रश्मि तुव्योजसं गोः ॥

IV. 22. 8bed.

‘May the power of the shining god (Agni), who toils with his holy work, bring you, the powerful (son) of the cow (i.e. Aditi) towards us, as a swift horse leads his reins.’

(Agni's) śakti and the powerful (son) of the cow i.e. Indra are respectively the principal and the subsidiary upameyas. They are compared with 'a swift horse' and 'his reins' in order. We supply 'putram' after 'goh'. Aditi is called 'gr̥ṣṭi' at IV. 18. 10 and Indra is called 'gārṣṭeya' at X. 111. 2b.

The simile itself is rather interesting. Ordinarily, it is the 'raśmi' which guides a horse; but this is true only of a dull horse. A swift and intelligent horse, however, goes forward according to the will of the rider, even before his will is conveyed to him through the 'raśmi'. Thus the 'raśmi' has no occasion to check his movements and goes wherever the horse goes.

It should be noted how the whole simile is emboxed within the two upameyas i.e. 'śakti' and 'goh' (putram).

(13) अग्नीं न आवृत्स्व चक्रं न वृत्तमवर्ततः ।

नियुद्धिश्चर्षणीनाम् ॥

IV. 31. 4.

'Owing to the hymns of our people, follow us closely as the rolling wheel follows horses.'

'Tvam' and 'naḥ', the principal and the subsidiary upameyas are respectively compared with 'vṛttam cakram' and 'arvataḥ'. The principal upamāna consists of two words i.e. 'cakram' and 'vṛttam' and *Na* therefore, finds a place between these two, instead of between the two upamānas. See above note on No. (2). 'Arvataḥ' is a sympathetic plural under the influence of 'naḥ' and also perhaps on account of the metre. 'abhi āvavṛtsva' expresses the common property.

(14) ते रायसोषं द्रविणान्यस्मे धत्त ऋभवः क्षेमयन्तो न मित्रम् ।

IV. 33. 10cd.

'Such as you are, oh Rbhus, bestow on us abundance of riches and wealth, just as those who desire to settle (in a new place) bestow their friendship (upon the neighbours in that place).'

'Te (yūyam)' and 'draviṇāni rāyas poṣam' are the principal and the subsidiary upameyas; they are respectively compared with 'kṣemayanto' and 'mitram', the common term being 'dhatta'. The same simile occurs again at II. 4. 3.

(15) वृत्तं स्मास्य द्रवतस्तुरण्यतः पूर्णं न वेरनुवाति प्रगृधिनः ।

[श्येनस्यैव ध्रजतो] अंकुसं परि दधिकाव्णः सहोर्जा तरित्रतः ॥

IV. 40. 3.

'And (the wind) blows favourably after the legs of this greedy, running and overpowering Dadhikrā [who swoops like a hawk], and who vanquishes (the foes) with his strength together with (us), as it blows after the wings of a bird.'

Supply 'vātaḥ' in *b*; 'Dadhikrāvan' and his 'aṅkas' are respectively compared with a 'vi' and his 'parṇam'. The whole simile, however, finds itself entangled between the adjectives of 'dadhikrā', the principal upameya. The poet means to say that even the wind seems to blow favourably when Dadhikrā dashes forward with speed like a swooping hawk. The meaning of aṅkas ought to present no difficulty at all. Its original meaning 'hook'

is still applicable to the secondary sense (1) 'leg (as in the present passage) which is attached like a hook to the main body, or (2) 'the sharp bends' of the road (cf. *pathām aṅkāṁsi*: IV. 40. 4d), where one arm of it looks like a hook attached to another.

(16) मध्वो न मक्षः सवनानि गच्छथः ।

IV. 45. 4d.

'You go to our libations as bees go to honey.'

'Yuvam' and 'savanāni', the principal and the subsidiary upameyas are respectively compared with 'makṣaḥ' and 'madhvah'. 'Gacchathah' expresses the common property, along with 'lobhena' which is implied. To construe 'madhvah' with 'savanāni' (Geld. Trans. p. 432—'Trankopfern der Suszigkeit'), in spite of the position of Na, is surely doing violence to a Vedic simile. If it is hard to take 'madhvah' as accusative plural of the noun madhu with Sāyana and Oldenberg, (ZDMG. Vol. 61, p. 817), who compares VII, 32, 2b, we may perhaps interpret the sentence as a *simple* simile, with a qualified upamāna i.e. 'madhvah makṣaḥ'—('flies of honey').

(17) युवां हि यन्तीन्द्रवो निम्नमापो न सञ्च्रक् ॥

IV. 47. 2cd.

'For, the Juices flow together towards you two, as the waters flow together towards a low place.'

'Indavo' and 'yuvām' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas and are respectively compared with 'āpo' and 'nimnam'. 'Sadhryak yanti' is the common term. 'Na' is shifted from its usual place between the two upamānas owing to metre and fear of a hiatus. Of the common property, the unimportant part is pushed between the two upameyas while the important one is mentioned last, for emphasis. For the simile, cf. also VIII. 32. 23c.

(b) Fully expressed similes with *iva*.

(18) सखे सखायमभ्याववृत्त्वा[शुं न चक्रं] रथ्यैव रंहा ॥

'Oh friend, follow the friend i.e. Varuna, as swift horses follow the cart-laden riches (of the enemy).'

See above No. (1) for the explanation of the stanza.

(19) अयं योनिश्चक्रमा यं वयं ते जायेव पत्य उशती सुवासाः ॥

IV. 3. 2ab.

'This is the resting place, which we have prepared for you as a well-dressed and loving wife does for her husband.'

'Vayam' and 'te' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas, respectively compared with 'jāyā', and 'patyo'. The common property is expressed by 'yam (yonim) cakṛma'. The two adjectives of 'jāyā' which have become almost proverbial in the RV. (cf. I. 124. 7c; X. 71. 4d; X. 91. 13d) suggest corresponding adjectives of the principal upameya 'vayam'. 'We have prepared, etc., with as much *pomp* and *eagerness* as a wife shows in preparing, etc.'

(20) आदत्तं वज्रं [स्थविरं न भीम] उद्रेव कोशं वसुना न्यृष्टम् ॥

IV. 20. 6cd.

'Who breaks open the bolt (i.e. bolt-like rocky stall of Vala), which is filled with riches as a jar is filled with water.'

'Vajra' and 'vasu' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas, and they are respectively compared with 'kośa' and 'udan', the common term being 'nirṣtam'.

'Vajram' in this passage, as also in III. 44. 5b, undoubtedly stands for the rocky stall of Vala. Evidently this is the case of an early Vedic *atiśayokti*, whose beginnings are clearly traceable in such attributives as 'Vṛṣā' 'Vṛṣabha' or 'Mahiṣa' as used of the Vedic deities; see above under No. 8. In the present case, the existence of an *atiśayokti* is rendered very probable by the use of the same *alamkāra* with reference to the same terms i.e. 'Vajra' and 'adri' in a converse manner. Thus Indra's 'Vajra' is called 'āsmā' at II. 30. 5; IV. 22. 1; or 'adri' at I. 61. 7 (Indra is called 'adriṣas') or even a 'parvata' at VI. 22. 6. By a mere reversion of the process, the 'adri' is called 'vajra' in our passages. For the explanation of the other simile, see below No. 138.

(21) जोषयासे गिरश्च नः । वधूयुरिव योषणाम् ॥

IV. 32. 16bc.

'May you joyfully accept our hymns, as one longing for a wife accepts a lovely bride.'

'Tvam' and 'giraḥ' are the principal and the subsidiary upameyas; they are compared respectively with a 'vadhūyu' and a 'yoṣaṇā'. The common property is expressed by 'joṣayāse'.

The same simile occurs again at III. 52. 3 (in the same words and same context) and III. 62. 8 for the same 'upameyas'.

(22) आ वः पीतयौमिषिले अहामिमा अस्तं नवृखं इव गमन् ॥

IV. 34. 5cd.

'These drinks have approached you as the newly calved cows approach their home at the time of the close of the day.'

'Pitayah' and 'vaḥ' are the principal and the subsidiary upameyas which are respectively compared with 'navasvaḥ' and 'astam'. The common property is expressed by 'ahnām abhipitve agman'. Our simile is very forceful since the word 'navasvaḥ' (and not merely 'gāvaḥ' or 'dhenavaḥ' as in I. 66. 5; IX. 66. 12, etc.) is used, thus suggesting great *eagerness* with which the 'navasvaḥ' in the simile and 'pitayah' approach their respective goals.

(23) उत स्मास्य तन्यतोर्वि द्योर्द्वयायतो अभियुजो भयन्ते ॥

IV. 38. 8ab.

'And indeed they tremble before the attack (abhiyujō) of this furious (Dadhikrā) as before the thunder of the Heaven!'

'Bhāyataḥ (dadhikrāvṇaḥ)' and 'abhiyujah' (abl. sing.) are the two upameyas, which are respectively compared with 'dyoḥ' and 'tanyatoḥ'. 'Bhayante' expresses the common property.

I have taken 'abhiyujah' as a noun of action, following Oldenberg and Geldner. I am not, however, thoroughly satisfied with the interpretation. The word does not seem to have been used as a noun of action in the RV. It always means 'foes' (those who attack) and thus the first impression that it is the subject of 'bhayante' is difficult to remove. We may rather supply 'manyoh' after 'rghāyatah' and compare 'Rghāyatah manyave' at X. 113. 6b. In that case, the simile would be an *ekadeśavivartinā sāṅga upamā* and would belong to the second group (Nos. 28-41).

(24) आ दधिक्रा शर्वसा पञ्च कृष्टीः सूर्य इव ज्योतिषापस्ततान ॥

IV. 38. 10ab.

'Dadhikrā has filled the five tribes of men with his might, as the sun fills the waters with his light.'

This is one of the few triple similes occurring in the RV. (see below Nos. 37, 39). 'Dadhikrā' is the chief upameya, 'krṣṭīh' and 'śavasā' being its subsidiaries. Correspondingly, 'sūryah' is the chief upamāna; 'apah' and 'jyotiṣā' are its subsidiaries. 'Tatāna' expresses the common property.

(25) इन्द्रा युवं वरुणा भूतमस्या धियः प्रेतारा वृषमेव धेनोः ॥

IV. 41. 5ab.

'Be the lovers of this prayer, oh Indra and Varuṇa, as two bulls become of a cow.'

'Yuvam' and 'dhiyah' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas; they are respectively compared with 'vṛṣabhā' and 'dhenuh' the common property being expressed by 'pretārā bhūtam'. The dual 'vṛṣabhā' is used under the influence of the dual upameya. It has no significance by itself. Such a sympathetic dual is often found in the R̥gveda; cf. e.g. Nos. 114, 121, 122 below. Compare also Oldenberg's remarks on this passage at ZDMG., Vol. 61, p. 831.

(26) क्षेत्रस्य पते मधुमन्तमूर्मिं धेनुर्विव पयो अस्मासु धुक्ष्व ॥

IV. 57. 2ab.

'Oh Lord of the Fields, yield us your sweet wave, as a cow yields her milk.'

'Tvam' and 'ūrmim' are the two upameyas which are respectively compared with 'dhenuh' and 'payah'. 'Dhukṣva' expresses the common property. 'Madhumān ūrmi' is the spring of sweet water.

(27) अग्निं प्रवन्तु समनेव योषाः कल्याण्यः १ स्मयमानासो अग्निम् ॥

घृतस्य धाराः—

IV. 58. 8ab.

'The streams of ghee, beautiful and smiling, move forth towards Agni as women towards a festival.'

'Samanā' is loc. (or instr.) of 'samana' used adverbially and is certainly intended to correspond to 'agnim' which is the subsidiary upameya. 'Abhi pravanta' (and perhaps 'kalyāṇyah' and 'smayamānāso') constitute the common term. As a matter of fact, we should have expected 'samanam na

yosāḥ' as at RV. X. 168. 2b. Why the poet used 'samanā iva' is more than what we can say. Perhaps the poet's fondness for the form 'samanā' (cf. IV. 5. 7; 43. 7; 51. 8a and b, 9a and c) may account for this.

GROUP II.—PARTIALLY EXPRESSED COMPOUND SIMILES.

Under this head, I have put together all Ekadeśavivartini Sāṅga Upamās, where an upamāna or upameya is dropped and has to be supplied owing to the force of the other expressed parts of the compound simile.

(28) सुकर्मणः सुरचो देव्यन्तो यो न देवा जनिमा धमन्तः ।

शुचन्तो अग्निं ववृधन्त इन्द्रमूर्ध्वं गव्यं परिषदन्तो अगमन् ॥

IV. 2. 17.

'The skilful, glorious and pious gods (i.e. Āṅgirasas), blowing up (i.e. inspiring with confidence) the beings (in the cave), as (a blacksmith blows up) iron, brightening up Agni and strengthening Indra, went forth surrounding the stall of the cows.'

Here 'devāḥ' and 'janimā' are respectively the principal and the subsidiary upameyas. Only one upamāna corresponding to 'janimā', however, is actually employed by the poet. The other one, corresponding to the principal upameya 'devāḥ' has to be supplied. It may either be 'karmārah' (X. 72. 2) or 'dhmātā' (V. 9. 5).

'Janimā' are the creatures imprisoned in the cave of Vala. 'Dhamantah' means 'strengthening', 'encouraging' or 'making them hopeful', etc. \sqrt{dham} without a preposition or with the prepositions 'anu', 'sam' and 'upa' (cf. II., 24. 7; VIII. 7. 16; X. 81. 3; V. 9. 5, etc.) has the meaning of 'encourage', 'fatten', 'invigorate', etc. It has the opposite meaning of 'destroy, blow out, etc.', when it takes the prepositions 'parā', 'nis', 'apa' or 'abhi'; (cf. X. 145. 2; V. 31. 9; VIII. 96. 13; I. 117. 21).

It should be noted that the missing upamāna 'dhmātā' or 'karmārah' can be legitimately supplied after 'na', since this particle is pretty regularly found *between* the principal and the subsidiary upamānas in the case of the Sāṅga upamās. The consequent hyperbaton ('devā janimā' instead of the naturally expected 'janimā devā') must be attributed to metre alone.

It is indeed very tempting to construe 'devā' as an adjective of 'janimā' against the Padapāṭha. We may compare 'devāya janmane' at I. 20. 1a and 'devānām janimā' in the next stanza, i.e. IV. 2. 18. These 'devā janimā' are naturally 'Agni and Indra' mentioned in c. We may also compare III. 30. 10 (vāniḥ puruhūtam dhamantiḥ), II. 34. 1 (Marutaḥ bhṛmīḥ dhamantah); II. 24. 7 (Te bāhubhyām dhamitam agnim), where Agni and Indra are the objects of \sqrt{dham} . The adjective 'devayantah' of the Āṅgirasas also favours such a construction (though ordinarily 'devāḥ' referring to them is not impossible: cf. Monson, V.M. p. 142). This construction, however, would not so forcibly suggest the missing upamāna, i.e. 'dhmātā'. It would on the other hand imply that 'ayo na devā janima' is a complete simple simile in itself, having no connection with 'devayantah' as an upameya belonging to it.

(29) बृहद्भाः । उपस्तभाय दुपुमिन्न रोधः ।

IV. 5. 1bd.

'He who shines mightily, i.e. Agni (brhad bhāḥ) supports (the heaven or his smoke) as a pillar supports the wall.'

Here the principal upameya is Agni described in the first three lines. (The words 'brhad bhāh' which are evidently in the nominative case refer to Agni; cf. VII. 8. 4b). The subsidiary upameya dyām (cf. I. 67. 3b) or 'dhūmam' (cf. IV. 6. 2d) is forced upon us by the subsidiary upamāna 'rodhas'.

(30) वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् ।

रुद्राक्षानः सुहृद्भीकरूपः क्षितिर्न राया पुष्ट्वारो अद्यौत् ॥

IV. 5. 15bcd.

'The face of the god shone in the house; the god of lovely appearance, chosen by many, having put on his bright (light) has shone (with his face) as a house with riches.'

'Puruvārah, i.e. Agni is compared with 'kṣītiḥ' which is the principal upamāna and 'rāyā' which is the subsidiary upamāna, naturally suggests the corresponding subsidiary upameya, i.e. 'anikena' (or perhaps 'ruṣatā tejasā'). This shining 'anika' is already mentioned in b of the same stanza, and corresponds to 'sarādrṣṭi' at I. 144. 7d (raṇvaḥ samdrṣṭau pitumān iva kṣayaḥ) where the same simile is used with different words.

(31) प्र ते दिवो न स्तनयन्ति शुष्माः ॥

IV. 10. 4c.

'Your breaths roar aloud like (the thunders) of the heaven.'

Generally, the 'śuśmāḥ' of Agni and Indra (and not of Dyauḥ) are spoken of in RV. This fact, coupled with VII. 3. 6c (divo na te tanyatur eti śuśmah) shows that in the passage, we have to supply 'tanyavaḥ' as the principal upamāna corresponding to 'śuśmāḥ'. 'Divāḥ' is the subsidiary upamāna for 'te'. 'Stanayanti' expresses the common property; cf. also V. 25. 8.

(32) द्यावो न युत्रैरमिसन्तो अर्यः क्षपो मदेस शरदश्च पूर्वाः ॥

IV. 16. 19cd.

'May we rejoice through many nights and years overpowering the enemies with our glories as the Heavens do (the Earth).

'Dyumnaiḥ abhisanto' expresses the common property in this compound simile. 'Vayam' is the principal and 'aryaḥ' the subsidiary upameya. Of the corresponding upamānas, only the principal one, i.e. 'dyāvaḥ' is expressly stated, while the other, i.e. 'bhūmiḥ' has to be understood in view of RV. X. 59. 3 (abhi śu ayaḥ paumsyair bhavem dyaur na bhūmim . . .).

(33) यो अस्य शुष्मं सुहृदैरियति वातो न जूतः स्तनयद्भिरभैः ॥

IV. 17. 12cd.

'Who, urged (by the powerful Maruts), like the wind incited by the roaring clouds, puts forth his strength in an instant.'

In c, we have to supply 'nṛbhiś śākaiḥ' from v. 11 of the same hymn as is suggested by the subsidiary upamāna 'abhraiḥ'. It is obvious that Indra incited by the Maruts is compared with the Wind urged on by the roaring clouds. Thus 'jūtaḥ śuśman iyarti' expresses the common property. I take 'muhukaiḥ' as an adverb in the sense of 'in a moment'. Compare 'muhuke' and 'muhu' in the same sense at IV. 16. 17b and 20. 9b.

Though, ordinarily, it is the followers (like 'abhrāṇi' and the Maruts) that are 'jūta' or inspired by their leaders (like the Wind and Indra), yet sometimes the leader also feels greatly encouraged when he sees his followers in cheerful spirits. In the simile, the adjective 'stanayadbhiḥ' signifies this cheerful spirit of the clouds which encourages their leader Vāta. 'Asya' is reflexive.

It is interesting to note how 'jūtaḥ', a portion of the common term finds itself between the two upamānas. To remove this difficulty by taking Vāta alone as a qualified upamāna for 'yah' would be doing injustice to all those passages in which the Maruts are described as the inspirers of Indra.

(34) आ कृष्ण ई जुहुराणो जिघर्ति लुचो बुध्रे रजसो अस्य योनौ ।

असिकन्यां यजमानो न होता ॥

IV. 17. 14cd; 15.

'The Black one (i.e. the Etaśa) turns back (juhurāṇo), and dashes forth toward it (i.e. the sun, to carry it back to the East) at the bottom of the skin (i.e. the sky) at the resting place of this region (i.e. mid-air). Just as a priest, sacrificing at night (goes towards his Fire).'

In the first half of this difficult stanza which undoubtedly describes the sunset, Indra is said to have thrown down the wheel of the sun (below the horizon in the West) and stopped Etaśa, who was still moving forward (towards the West). Etaśa did not know when to stop in his westward course, while taking away the sun's car with him. So Indra stopped him. Etaśa then realized his error and at once turned back and rushed towards the sun in order to take him now to his rising place in the East, for the next day. This is described in the passage under discussion and Etaśa is compared with a priest sacrificing at night and hastening towards his sacrificial fire.

'Asiknyām jighartī' expresses the common property, i.e. the unusual nightly activity. 'Kṛṣṇaḥ' refers to Etaśa who is conceived as 'dark' at night (the sun's lustre is said to be black at night; cf. I. 115.5cd) and who is the principal horse drawing the sun's car; cf. VII. 63. 2; 66. 14 &c. 'im' refers to 'Sūrya' mentioned in the first half of the stanza. These two (i.e. kṛṣṇaḥ and im) are the principal and subsidiary upameyas respectively. Of the corresponding upamānas, i.e. 'hotā' and 'Agnim', only the first is mentioned, the second is to be supplied.

The particle 'na' finds itself between the two words (yajamāno and hotā) of which the principal upamāna consists, according to the rule stated above in a note on No. (2) above.

(35) अवांसृजन्तु जिघ्र्यो न देवा भुवः सम्राजिन्द्र सत्ययोनिः ॥

IV. 19. 2ab.

'Like old men who abandon (their property in favour of their inheritors), the gods abandoned (the supreme rulership) and thus, oh Indra, you who never yield your place to another became the sovereign ruler.'

'Devāḥ' and 'sāmraḥjyam' (to be extracted from the word 'samrāt' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas respectively. They are compared with 'jivrayah' and 'rayim' or 'vedas' of which the first only is expressly stated, while the second is clearly suggested by the word 'samrāt'. Compare e.g. I. 70. 5 (pitur na jivrer vi vedo bharanta); or I. 116. 3 (rayim na kaścit mamrvān avāhāḥ) or X. 108. 5 (Kas te enā avasrjāt ayudhvi), which unmistakably suggest that 'ava + √srj' (= 'ava + √hā') is a transitive verb and must have

some object; in the case of the upameyavākya, it must be 'sāmraṣyam', as is indicated by the word 'samrāt' (The gods abandoned 'sāmraṣyam'; Indra picked it up and thus became a *samrāt*, i.e. sāmraṣyavān) while in the upamānavākya, it is 'rayi' or 'vedas' as is clear from RV. I. 70. 5 and I. 116. 3, and from the upameya 'sāmraṣyam'.

As a matter of fact, both the subsidiary upameya and upamāna, i.e. 'sāmraṣyam' and 'rayim' have to be supplied. But this need not lead us to assume that the simile was conceived as a simple and not as a compound one. For, as said above, the poet's use of the transitive verb 'ava+√srj' and the adjective 'samrāt' used of Indra, suggest that he had conceived this as a *sāṅga upamā*.

(36) अग्निं प्रदुर्जनयो न गर्भं [रथा इव प्रययुः] साकमद्रयः ॥

IV. 19. 5ab.

'The mountains (i.e. the mountain-streams) ran eagerly together towards (you), as women towards their child.

[They rolled forward like chariots].'

'Adrayaḥ' is another example of an early Vedic *atiśayokti* (see above under Nos. 8, 20; and stands for 'adritulyāḥ āpaḥ'.

The principal upameya 'adrayaḥ' is compared with 'janayaḥ', while the subsidiary upameya 'tvām, i.e. Indram' has to be supplied in view of the subsidiary upamāna 'garbham'; also cf. IX. 69. 9 (*rathā iva pra yayur indram*). That the 'āpaḥ' considered Indra as their child is also not to be forgotten; cf. IV. 18. 8; I. 33. 11; X. 30. 4; 43. 3 &c. It must be remembered that *b* contains 12 syllables when only 11 are expected. 'Adreḥ' or 'āpaḥ' would have been thus more natural in the place of 'adrayaḥ'. But the poet actually uses 'adrayaḥ' obviously with some object in view. This object could not be any but a rhetorical one. In the stanza, he is giving a description of what he imagines must have happened when Indra killed Vala and set free the rivers pent up by him (*d*); when suddenly the floods began to move from all sides of the rocky cave of Vala, they presented an appearance of the rocks themselves moving forward, being reduced to fluidity! The poet thus seems to have deliberately chosen the expression 'adrayaḥ' to convey the idea of the *vastness of the mass* of the waters and also their *all-round mobility*. Everywhere around, there was flowing water and it appeared as if the mountains themselves had melted and were flowing forward. I do not think that 'adrayaḥ' here stands for 'adrijātāḥ', as 'girayaḥ' stands for 'griijātāḥ' at VI. 66. 11d or as 'gāvaḥ' stands for 'gojātāḥ' at IV. 41. 8c. For, then the choice of 'adrayaḥ' for the metrically natural 'adreḥ' or 'āpaḥ' remains unmotivated.

(37) ऋजिप्य ईमिन्द्रावतो न भुज्युं इयेनो जभार बृहतो अधिष्णोः ॥

IV. 27. 4ab.

'The impetuous Śyena bore him (i.e. Soma) away from the lofty peak (i.e. of the heaven) just as (the arāvā) took away Bhujyu from his Indra-befriended (enemy).'

The simile is a triple one (see above No. 24 and below No. 39); 'śyena' is the principal upameya, its two subsidiaries being 'snoḥ' and 'im, i.e. somam'. This śyena is compared with some one (obviously with 'arāvā' who enjoyed the favour of the Asvinā and saved Bhujyu; cf. VII. 68. 7c) who carried away or saved 'Bhujyu' from his enemy who was 'Indravān', i.e. enjoyed the favour of Indra.

The poet very aptly compares the two situations. The feat of the 'śyena' is as great as that of the 'arāvā'; for, just as 'arāvā' saved 'Bhujyu'

when he was cast in the middle of the ocean by his treacherous friends, and when his father Tugra was unable to save him (cf. VII. 68. 7; I. 116. 3, etc.), in spite of the fact that the person (i.e. the enemy of Tugra; see below) from whom he was saving 'Bhuju' was 'Indra-favoured', so also the *śyena* saved or carried away 'Soma' from some thing, i.e. 'brhat snu' which was as difficult to tackle with as the 'Indravān fore of Tugra'. Thus one of the upamānas, namely the principal one, has to be supplied and it is 'arāvā' as said above.

The reading 'indravataḥ' is quite satisfactory. It corresponds to 'snoḥ' (mark the ablatives) and refers to something (i.e. the place or the person) which is as difficult as 'snu' to tackle with and from which 'Bhuju' was rescued. In the rescue of 'Bhuju', it does not appear that the 'arāvā' assisted by *Asvinā* had actually to fight with the *Indravān* enemy of Bhuju and his father Tugra, but surely there did exist such a danger! At the time of saving Bhuju, Tugra was not a worshipper of Indra; on the contrary, he seems to have been fighting with an enemy favoured by Indra. I construe the story of Tugra and Bhuju as follows:—

Tugra was for a long time a non-believer in Indra and *Asvinā*; cf. VI. 20. 8; 26. 4; X. 49. 4. He was once fighting with his enemies, probably *Vetasu* and *Kutsa* who were the protégés of Indra. On one occasion, he seems to have sent his son Bhuju against his enemies, as a commander of a war-ship. Bhuju, however, was treacherously drowned by his friends in the ship, but was saved by an *arāvā* with the help of the *Asvinā* (VII. 68. 7). It is probable that Tugra himself was present in another ship on the occasion, but was unable to save his son from his treacherous friends and therefore had helplessly abandoned Bhuju to his fate as a rich man helplessly abandons his property when dying! (cf. I. 116. 3). After this incident, and mainly through the influence of his son Bhuju, Tugra became a worshipper of the *Asvinā* (cf. I. 117. 14ab) and perhaps also of Indra. Indra is called *Tugrya-Vṛdh* at VIII. 45. 29; and 99. 7. Also cf. I. 33. 15.

(38) ता वृं धियोवसे वाजयन्तीराजिं न जग्मुर्बुधूः सुदानू ॥

IV. 41. 8ab.

'Those hymns longing for you and desiring loot, oh bounteous gods, go to you for a favour, as (the racing mares) go to a race.'

'*Dhiyaḥ*' and '*vām*' are the principal and subsidiary upameyas respectively. They are respectively compared with '*raghviḥ*' and '*ājim*'. Of these, the first has to be supplied, while the other is actually mentioned by the poet. Compare for the same simile V. 41. 4d; IV. 5. 13b; VI. 24. 6d.; IX. 32. 5c &c. '*Vājayantiḥ jagmuḥ*' is the common term.

(39) श्रिये न गाव उप् सोममस्थुरिन्द्रं गिरो वर्हणं मे मनीषाः ॥

IV. 41. 8cd.

'My hymns and prayers have approached Indra and Varuṇa (to rest) as the cows (i.e. their milk) approach Soma for infusion.'

This is a triple simile (see above Nos. 24, 37). '*Gāvaḥ*' is the principal upamāna; '*somam*' and '*śriye*' are its subsidiaries. The corresponding upameyas are '*gīrah-maniṣāḥ*', '*Indram-Varuṇam*' and '*spraṣṭum* or *rantum* or *śrayitum*'. The first two are expressed, while the third has to be supplied in view of I. 16. 7ab; IV. 41. 1ed; 43. 1d; VII. 86 8b; X. 91. 13c; 47. 7c, etc. It is also possible to imagine that the poet intended '*śriye*' to be a common double-meaning infinitive of the two roots '*śri*' to mix and '*śri*' to rest, applicable both in the upamāna and the upameya vākyas, though primarily intended for the former alone as is clear from the position of '*na*' which never stands at the beginning of an upamāna vākya. Compare Oldenberg, ZDMG.,

Vol. 61, pp. 815, 825, parti: p. 817. It is, however, difficult to say at this stage whether such a śabda-śleṣa can be allowed in early Rgvedic poetry.

(40) अग्निः ... मेतैव धूमं स्तभायुदुप याम् ॥

IV. 6. 2d.

'Agni has erected his smoke towards the heaven as a planter erects (the sacrificial post).'

'Upa dyām stabhāyat' expresses the common property. 'Agniḥ' and 'dhūmam' are the principal and subordinate upameyas, which are respectively compared with 'metā' and 'svarum'. The last has to be supplied in view of III. 8. 6-7; IV. 51. 2 &c.

(41) अथा हि लां जग्मुरे मर्तासो विक्षीब्धम् ।

ऋतावानं विचेतसं पश्यन्तो यामिन्व स्तुभिः ॥

IV. 7. 2 cd; 3ab.

'The mortals indeed have seized you, who are fit to be praised among the people, holy and wise, when they saw you (distinguished by your sparks or flames) as they see the heaven (distinguished) by the stars.'

The heaven is distinguished by its stars; cf. II. 2. 5d; 34. 2a; I. 166. 11b; X. 68. 11b; similarly, Agni is distinguished by his sparks (arcayah); cf. V. 17. 3c; 25. 8a &c. Accordingly, the subsidiary upameya 'arcibhiḥ' has to be supplied to correspond with 'stṛbhiḥ' of the simile. 'Paśyanto' with perhaps 'vyaktam' supplied expresses the common property.

GROUP III.—SIMPLE SIMILES WITH A QUALIFIED UPAMĀNA.

Under this group, I have arranged all those similes in which there is only one upamāna. The peculiarity of this upamāna, however, is that it consists of two or more words. One of these is the real upamāna, while the other is either its adjective agreeing with it in number and gender or a noun in an oblique case, generally the genitive. I have separated these from the similes in the next group in order to draw attention to the position of the particle of comparison *na* or *iva*, which finds itself *between* the words of which the upamāna consists and may come after any one of these, i.e. the noun or its attributive. Conversely, there is a presumption generally that an adjective or a word in the genitive case, between which and the regular upamāna the particle of comparison is found, belongs to the upamāna and not to the upameya.

(a) Similes with *na*.

(42) अस्य श्रेष्ठां सुभगस्य सुदह् ... शुचिं घृतं न तृप्तमध्यायाः ॥

IV. 1. 6ac.

'The glorious appearance of this lovely god is pure and bright (śuci) like the heated ghee of a cow.'

'Śuci' expresses the common property; but it agrees with the upamāna which happens only in rare cases. Generally the word expressing common property agrees with the upameya in respect of gender, number, and person when it does not agree with both. Śaṅkara indeed takes 'śuci' as merely

another adjective of the upamāna and construes 'spārḥā' as the Sādhārāṇa Dharma. 'Spārḥā', however, seems to belong to the following simile rather than to this one. Besides the upamāna 'ghṛta' is used in the Rgveda to compare a thing for its 'purity' cf. IV. 57. 2c; III. 2. 1b; IV. 10. 6ab; V. 86. 6b; VIII. 12. 4b; VI. 10. 2d; IX. 67. 12ab. It must be conceded, however, that in all the passages the word 'śuci' or 'pūtam' is used as an adjective of 'ghṛtam' and it is possible that the poet may have intended a similar construction in our passage. In that case, we must supply some such word as 'pūta' to express the common property between 'saṁdr̥k' and 'ghṛtam'.

(43) अर्णोभिरापो मधुमद्विरमे ।

वाजी न सर्गेषु प्रस्तुभानः प्र सद्मित्स्ववितवे दधन्युः ॥

IV. 3. 12 bcd.

'May the rivers run forward with their sweet waters to flow for ever, like a race-horse encouraged in his gallops.'

'Āpo' is the upameya compared with 'sargeṣu prastubhāno vāji'. For the same upamāna, cf. IV. 10. 1a (No. 4 above).

(44) कृणुष्व पाजः प्रसितिं न पृथ्वीम् ।

IV. 4. 1a.

'Spread out your light like a broad net.'

Here 'prasitim' is the upamāna and 'pṛthvīm' is its adjective. Elsewhere, however, 'prasiti' itself is said to belong to Agni; cf. IV. 4. 1c; II. 25. 3c; VII. 3. 4c; X. 87. 11a, 15d. It appears that in the passage under discussion as also in VI. 6. 5 (śūrasyeva prasitiḥ kṣātir agneḥ) agni's spreading lustre is compared with a 'prasiti', while in the remaining passages it is identified with it. It is doubtful whether we should consider the latter as examples of 'Atiśayokti'. It depends upon what we assume, was in the poet's mind. He might have called Agni's light 'a prasiti' either because of the resemblance of the two or even because he considered the light itself as the actual weapon in the hands of the Deity. In the second case there is no 'atiśayokti'.

It should also be noted that Agni is called 'pṛthupājāḥ' (III. 2. 11; 3. 1; 5. 1; 27. 5, etc.) and his 'pājas' is said to be 'pṛthu' (VII. 10. 1a). His 'amati' too is 'pṛthvi' (VII. 38. 2). Yet 'kṛṇuṣva' alone (and not pṛthvīm also) constitutes the common term here.

(45) नीचा तं धक्ष्यतु सं न शुष्कम् ॥

IV. 4. 4d.

'Burn him down like dry grass.'

At VIII. 60. 7, an enemy is compared with 'vṛddham atasam' and Agni is asked to burn him down.

(46) सामं द्विर्द्वा महिं ...

पुदं न गोरपंगूळहं विविद्धानग्निर्मह्यं प्रेदुं वोचन्मनीषाम् ॥

IV. 5. 3acd.

'Agni, knowing the great and powerful sāman concealed (or secret) like the place of a cow, has taught this hymn to me.'

Sāman is compared with the hiding place of Vala containing the cows. Agni is credited with the discovery of both.

'Goh apicyam padam' is also mentioned at IX. 71. 5. Perhaps 'goh padam' is the same as 'apichyam gor nāma' (I. 84. 15; IX. 87. 3) and refers to the secret and sacred names of a cow known only to the priests, through the gods like Varuna (VII. 87. 4; VIII. 41. 5) or Agni (X. 169. 2; V. 3. 3; I. 72. 6) or Soma (IX. 87. 3).

(47-48) अश्रातरो न योषणो व्यन्तः पतिरिपो न जनयो दुरेवाः ।

पापासुः सन्तो अनुता असुखा इदं पदमजनता गभीरम् ॥

IV. 5. 5.

'Going astray like brotherless women, wicked like wives who harm their husbands, these our sinful rivals, untruthful and dishonest, have created this difficult riddle (or fearful charm) for us.'

Pāpāsah' are obviously the rivals of the poet. They had produced a difficult riddle or fearful charm against the poet with the intention of defeating and vanquishing him and his party. But then they did not realize that that poet was supported by the great and wise Agni while they had not enjoyed that god's protection. Hence they were destined for a discomfiture.

In the two similes, Agni is respectively compared with a 'bhrātā,' and a 'pati' and the rivals with women! 'Vyantah' and 'durevāh' express the common property of the two similes.

'Abhrātaro yosāṇah' are very probably 'prostitutes'; cf. I. 124. 7a (abhrāteva pumsa eti pratiṇi). The prostitutes are rightly called 'abhrātaraḥ'. They cannot claim any one as their brother except through their mother. There cannot be any certainty, however, whether they both had a common father! Besides, all male relationships in the families of prostitutes are naturally neglected, as these are headed by women and not by men.

(49) अमिनते गुरुं भारं न मन्म ।

बृहद्वाथ धृष्टता गभीरं

IV. 5. 6bc.

'You have boldly bestowed on me this great and powerful (gabhiram) hymn like a heavy (important) load because I never neglect my duty!'

'Gururā bhāram' is the compound upamāna and Na should have been between the two words. But it comes after both owing to metre. 'Aminate dadhātha' is the common term.

(50) उदु खरुर्नवजा नाकः पुरवो अनक्ति सुधितः सुमेकः ॥

IV. 6. 3cd.

'The sacrificial post has indeed (stood) up like a newborn horse; well-shaped and well established, it now anoints the victims.'

Supply 'atiṣṭhat' in c and take 'paśvaḥ' as accusative, object of 'anakti', in d.

'Navajā akraḥ' is the upamāna with which the 'svaru' is compared in respect of 'freshness and erectness'.

(51) अधा मित्रो न सुधितः पावकोऽग्निर्दीदाय मानुषीषु विष्टु ॥

IV. 6. 7 cd.

‘Agni, the purifier, has shone among the human tribes like a well established friend.’

‘Sudhita’ is conceived as an adjective of the upamāna; cf. V. 3. 2c (where *Na* comes after both the words owing to metre); VI. 15. 2a; VIII. 23. 8c. Also cf. Oldenberg, ZDMG; Vol. 61, p. 822. The word expressive of a common property like ‘kṣemakarah’ must be supplied; cf. II. 4. 3; IV. 33. 10 &c; also I. 66. 2a (dādhāra kṣemam).

(52-53) द्विं पञ्च जीर्जनन्तुं वसानाः स्वसारो अग्निं मानुषीषु विष्टु ॥

उष्वर्धमथुर्योऽन दन्तं शुक्रं स्वासं परशुं न तिग्मम् ॥

IV. 6. 8.

‘The ten sisters together produce Agni among men, who wakes up in the morning, who is bright like the tooth of an Athari and who has a capacious mouth like a sharp hatchet.’

We have two similes here; ‘atharyo dantam’ and ‘paraśum tigmam’ are the two compound upamānas in them and ‘śukram’ and ‘svāsam’ respectively express their common property. That ‘tigmam’ belongs to ‘paraśum’ (and not to Agni) is not to be doubted. The word is never used as a direct adjective of Agni. It is always used of something *belonging* to Agni. Thus Agni is tigmānika (I. 95. 2); or tigmajambha (IV. 5. 4) or tigmabhṛṣṭi (IV. 5. 3); or tigmaśṛṅga (VI. 16. 39); or tigmaśoci (I. 79. 10) or tigmaheti (IV. 4. 4). Similarly, his ‘ema’ is tigma (VI. 3. 4); his ‘amśu’ is tigma (VIII. 72. 2); his ‘didyut’ is tigma (V. 86. 3) and his ‘jihva’ is tigma (IV. 7. 10).

For the second simile, cf. VI. 3. 4 (vijehamānaḥ parśur na jihvām) ‘lolling about his tongue like an axe. \sqrt{jih} ‘to loll’; cf. jihma and jihvā.

(54-55) त्वेषासो अग्ने अर्चयश्चरन्ति ।

इयेनासो न दुवसानासो अथं तुविष्णसो मारुतं न शयैः ॥

IV. 6. 10bcd.

‘Those flames of yours which are vehement like the hawks hastening towards their prey (lit. goal) and which roar mightily like the host of Maruts, move forth!’

‘Tveṣāso’ and ‘tuviṣvaṇaso’ respectively express the common property in the two similes. For the second, cf. I. 127. 6a; VI. 48. 15a. I naturally take ‘artham duvasanāso’ as going with ‘śyenāso’ alone.

(56) अग्ने तमद्य...क्रतुं न भद्रं हृदिस्पृशम् ॥

ऋध्यामा तु ओहैः ॥

IV. 10. 1.

See above No. (4) for translation. ‘Bhadra kratu’ is the upamāna. For bhadra as the adjective of kratu, cf. IV. 10. 2; X. 30. 12; I. 89. 1; 67. 1; 91. 5 &c.

(57) भवामो अवाक्स्वर्णं ज्योतिः ॥

IV. 10. 3b.

‘Come towards us like the sun, the luminary.’

For ‘svar jyotih’, cf. X. 43. 4d; also cf. ‘svar na śukarm’ II. 2. 7d; IV. 45. 2, &c.

(58) घृतं न पूतं तनूररेपाः शुचिं हिरण्यम् ।

तत्तै [रुक्मो न] रोचत स्वभावः ॥

IV. 10. 6.

‘Your body is faultless like pure ghee ! It is pure gold ! That (body) of yours shines [like a golden ornament], oh self-reliant god !’

‘Arepāh’ expresses the common property. ‘Śuchi hiranyam’ is an ‘atīśayokti’. For the upamāna ‘pūtam ghṛtam’, cf. No. (42) above.

(59-60) तमवन्तं न सानुसिमरुषं न दिवः शिशुम् ।

समृज्यन्ते दिवेदिवे ॥

IV. 15. 6.

‘They serve him (i.e. Agni) day after day, like a prize-winning racer and like the ruddy child of the heaven.’

‘Marmṛjyante’ expresses the common property in both the similes. Both the upamānas are qualified. For ‘sānasi’ as an adjective of a horse, cf. IX. 85. 5c; 100. 4d; X. 63. 14c &c. ‘Divah śīśuḥ’ is soma; cf. IX. 33. 5c; 38. 5b; 71. 7a.

(61) अवं स्य दूराध्वनो नान्तेस्मिन्नो अयं सवने मन्दध्वै ॥

IV. 16. 2ab.

‘Unyoke (your horses) to enjoy, oh brave god, at this libation of ours, today, as at the end of a journey.’

‘Ava sya’ expresses the common property; ‘adhvano ante’ is the qualified upamāna; ‘savane’ is the upameya.

The simile is very suggestive. The poet wants Indra not merely to *break* his journey and keep his car waiting with horses still yoked to it with the intention of soon resuming his journey, but to *finish* his journey at his sacrifice and enjoy at leisure as if it were his own home!

(62) यासि... ऋज्रा वाजं न गधुं युयूषन् ॥

IV. 16. 11c.

‘You go forth, desiring to keep together (i.e. make them run with equal speed) the straight-going (horses of Vāta) like a covetable loot (or loot which fills a cart up to the top).’

‘Gadhyam vājam’ is the upamāna; for gadhyam vājam, cf. IV. 16. 16; VI. 10. 6d; 26. 2b &c. ‘Yuyūṣan yāsi’ is the common term.

(63-64) सूर उपाके तन्वंदधानो.....

मृगो न हृस्ती तविषीमुषाणः सिंहो न भीम आयुधानि विभ्रंत ॥

IV. 16. 14acd.

'When you held your body by the side of the sun, you assumed supreme power (*taviṣim uṣāṇaḥ*) after seizing your weapons, like a wild elephant, like a formidable lion !

'*Taviṣim uṣāṇaḥ*' expresses the common property in both the similes. The first of these suggests 'the wild ferocity' of Indra while the second suggests 'his fearful stateliness'. For the first, cf. I. 64. 7c; for the second, cf. IX. 97. 28b. That '*taviṣim uṣāṇaḥ*' is the predicate is clear from V. 32. 2d and I. 35. 4d. In the first simile, the adjective '*hastin*' instead of the usual '*bhīmaḥ*' (cf. I. 154. 2; 190. 3; II. 33. 11) is employed to suggest perhaps the *upraised arm* of Indra, seizing a weapon.

(65) अर्नपच्युतं सदसो न भूम ॥

IV. 17. 4d.

'Always unmoved (from his adopted position) like the Earth from her seat.'

That '*sadasaḥ*' belongs to the *upamāna* alone and not to the *upameya*, i.e. Indra also (cf. VII. 22. 1c where '*suyataḥ*' belongs to both, though, strictly speaking, it is a part of the *upamāna* alone as the position of *Na* shows) is evident from VI. 17. 5 (*adriṣṇ nutthā acyutaṁ sadasaḥ pari svāt*) and also from the fact that Indra is always merely said to be '*anapacyuta*' (VIII. 93. 9; VIII. 92. 8) or '*acyuta*' (I. 52. 2; X. 111. 3), without any reference to his '*sadas*'. Hence also we are not expected to supply any corresponding word in the *upameyavākya*. In short, he is '*anānudaḥ*' (cf. I. 53. 8. II. 21. 4; X. 38. 5), not allowing the enemy to come forward even a single step by receding! '*Anapacyutaḥ*' is the common term.

(66) गुव्यन्तु इन्द्रं सुख्यायु विप्राः...आच्यविद्यामोवृते न कोशम् ॥

IV. 17. 16ad.

'Eager for cows, we the singers, move Indra (up and down) like a pitcher in the well.'

Indra is here compared with a pitcher *moving up and down* in a well. It comes up filled with water and goes down empty. Similarly Indra moves up and down between the H. and the E. Only unlike the jar, he is *empty* when he goes *up* and is *filled* with gifts when he goes *down* to the priests! The point of similarity is expressed by '*ācyavayāmaḥ*' which here signifies 'the upward and downward movement' like the '*kośa* in a well' and not merely 'violent shaking so as to empty completely' which is its meaning at RV. X. 42. 2 (*kośam na pūrnam vasunā nī ṛstam ā cyāvaya maghadeyāya śūram*: 'Shake violently so as to empty completely the brave (Indra) filled with riches like a pitcher filled (with water)'. In this latter passage Indra is compared with a jar filled with water and situated *high above* our heads. It is thus obvious that '*avate* and '*kośam*' together form the *upamāna* in the present passage.

(67) प्रायुवो न भन्वोऽन वक्वा अग्रुवा अपिन्वद्युवतीर्द्धः ॥

IV. 19. 7ab.

'Indra fully filled (i.e. impregnated) the youthful (rivers) which pull down their banks (dhvasra) and know the holy law, as (eagerly as) he did the girlish (streams) which gently break forth and babble!'

The stanza describes the impregnating activities of Indra. In the first half quoted above, the 'yuvatih' are compared with 'agruvah' in respect of 'being filled by Indra'. Both the upamāna and the upameya are 'Prakṛta'. But the existence of the common property is more easily granted in the one than in the other. Hence the choice of the former as the upamāna and of the latter as the upameya, though both are equally Prakṛta or the matter in hand. In the present passage, Indra's approaching the girls with fresh youth is used as the upamāna for his approaching the grown up (prauḍhā) women. The former is more natural than the latter. It is in such passages that *na* has the sense of a conjunctive particle. Compare for example (see also the note thereon) IV. 16. 15b (No. 135) 28. 3cd (No. 141) and 48. 1ab (No. 144) below. In the present simile, both the upamāna and the upameya have two adjectives each, which show that in spite of the difference in their nature Indra, the great Vṛṣā, has filled them *both* with equal zest! The 'yuvatis' are the large rivers which are 'dhvasra' and 'ṛtagña', i.e. they know the holy law according to which Indra must impregnate them (and therefore they do not raise a complaining voice!); whereas the 'agruṣ' are the mountain-rivulets which break through the sides of the mountains and babble forth in a girlish manner (or perhaps 'vakvāḥ' means who cried aloud when Indra approached them!). Indra, however, has impregnated both! In addition to the simile, we have two fine Atīśayoktis in 'agruvah' and 'yuvatih' in the stanza.

The upamāna is a qualified one, i.e. 'nabhanvaḥ vakvāḥ agruvaḥ'; *na* ordinarily is put between the upamāna and its adjective; but if the upamāna has two adjectives, this *na* is placed between the two adjectives.

(68-69) वि यो ररपश ऋषिभिर्नवेमिर्दुक्षो न पक्वः सृणो न जेत ॥

IV. 20. 5ab.

'Who is noisily surrounded (vi rarapśe) by younger poets like a tree which is (laden with) ripe (fruit), like a victor armed with a weapon (srñi)!'

See above No. (10) for the second half of the stanza. The stanza as a whole describes the difference between an old sage of established reputation like Vāmadeva, who can claim with confidence the help of Indra and the other younger poets, who are not so sure of it and therefore who crowd around him in the hope of getting at least an audience from him!

We have two similes here; in both 'virarapśe' is the common property. The upamānas in both again are qualified. For the first simile, also compare I. 8. 8 (*asya sunṛtā virapśi, gomātī pakvā śākhā na dāṣuṣe*) and III. 45. 4. 'srñyah' is one who is armed with 'srñi', which here probably means a 'hook-like' weapon. In classical literature the word means 'a goad' (aṅkuṣa).

If, however, it is contended that 'srñi' cannot have this meaning in the Rgveda, where it invariably signifies 'a hook' or 'a hooked stick', I propose the following interpretation of 'srñyo na jetā'—Indra is compared with a tree laden with ripe fruit in the first simile. But such a 'vrkṣa' is after all *passive* and cannot show his favours and disfavours. Any man may approach it and have the fruit; Indra, however, is not such a one; he has his likes and dislikes. Vāmadeva, therefore, immediately improves upon his first simile

and compares Indra with a *hook-man on such a tree!* According to this interpretation 'Sṛṇyo na' alone is the simile and 'jetā' is to be taken with Indra. (Transt.—who is surrounded, etc. like a tree with ripe fruit, like a hookman on such a tree!). The simile then will be comparable with X. 101. 3d (nediya it sṛṇyaḥ pakvam evāt) and III. 45. 4 (vṛkṣam pakvam falam aṅkiva dhunuhi). In view of the position of *na*, however, I am inclined to favour the first interpretation and there is no definite evidence *against* taking 'sṛṇi' as a 'weapon'.

(70) यस्य क्रतुर्विदुथ्यो ऽन सुम्राद् साहान्तरुत्रो अभ्यस्ति कृष्टीः ॥

IV. 21. 2cd.

'Whose wisdom, victorious and overpowering, rules over men like a universal monarch!'

'Vidatha' is universe as shown by me at BUJ. 1935, p. 26. 'vidathya samrāt' is the upamāna.

(71) पिपीळे अंशुमेधो न सिन्धुः ।

IV. 22. 8a.

'The stalk of soma (amśu) which is like (or as it were) a river of the gladdening juice, is pressed.'

For the rest of the stanza, cf. No. (12) above. In the present simile 'madyaḥ sindhuḥ' is the qualified upamāna. But 'pipīḷe' is not a satisfactory *sādhāraṇa dharma*; nor should a word like 'pūrṇaḥ' be supplied. The poet's intention to give us a sambhāvana rather than a simile is evident from the nature of the upamāna. The upamāna, as a rule, should be a well-known and existing thing, but can we say this of 'a river of the juice'? The poet thus seems to imagine the soma-stalk to be as it were 'a river full of the sweet gladdening juice'. In short, we have an *Utprekṣā* here, rather than an *Upamā*.

(72) दधिक्रासुं ददधुर्विध्वङ्गिम् । चक्रेत्यस्यै नृपतिं न शरम् ॥

IV. 38. 2bd.

'You indeed gave Dadhikrā, who is friendly to all men and who is fit to be praised by a nobleman like a brave king.'

'Aryaḥ carkṛtyam' expresses the common property. For 'nṛpatim na śūram', cf. 'medhayum na śūram' of the next number and 'asteva śūraḥ' at I. 70. 6b; VI. 64. 3c.

(73) पृथग्विध्वन्तं मेधयुं न शरं रथतुरं [वातसिन्धुं ध्रजन्तम्] ॥

IV. 38. 3cd.

'Who overpowers the chariots (of the enemy) like a brave warrior, greedily attacking them with his legs.'

'Rathaturam' expresses the common property. 'Medhayum' is a warrior who longs for 'medha' (food, nourishment, etc.) in a battle, which therefore is also called 'medhasāti' (a place where 'medha' is to be won). For the adjective of the upamāna, see the last number. Compare Nos. 117-118 for the other portions of the stanza.

(74-75) उत सैनं वस्त्रमग्निं न त्रायुमनुकोशन्ति क्षितश्चो भरेषु ॥

वीचार्थमानं जसुरिं न श्येनम् ॥

IV. 38. 5abc.

‘And the people (of the enemy) cry after him in battles as they do after a robber who robs everything including dress—after him (i.e. Dadhikrā), who swoops down upon (enemy’s property) like a famishing hawk!’

Dadhikrā is very ruthless while looting the enemy and therefore is compared with a robber who does not spare the robbed person even his loin-cloth! In the first simile ‘anukrośanti’ constitutes the common property, while ‘nicā ayamānam’ does so in the second. ‘Jasuri’ is from $\sqrt{\text{jas}}$ ‘to be exhausted, to famish with hunger’ etc.

(76) स्रजं कृष्णानो जन्त्यो न शुभ्वा ॥

IV. 38. 6c.

‘Wearing a garland like the beautiful bridal horse.’

It is difficult to say what exactly is meant by the upamāna ‘śubhvā janyaḥ’. ‘Janya’ in all other RV. passages is an adjective and means ‘belonging to or favourable to men’ and is derived from ‘jana’. Here, however, it is evidently a noun, ‘śubhvā’ being the adjective. Should we, therefore, derive it here from *jani* = ‘the bride’? ‘Srajam kṛṇvāno’ is the common term.

(77) यं पृथुभ्यो दीदिवानुं नाग्निं ददधुमित्रावरुणा ततुरिम् ॥

IV. 39. 2cd.

‘Him, who overpowers (his enemies) like flaming fire, you gave to Pūrus, oh Mitrāvarunā.’

‘Taturim’ obviously expresses the common property. ‘Dīdivāṁsam agnim’ is the upamāna. ‘Taturi’ is an adjective from $\sqrt{\text{tr}}$, ‘to cross, overpower’, etc.

(78) इन्द्रा को वां वरुणा सुस्रमापु स्तोमो हविष्मो अमृतो न होता ॥

IV. 41. 1ab.

‘Which hymn, accompanied by an oblation, has enjoyed your favour like the immortal priest, i.e. Agniḥ? Oh Indra and Varuṇa!’

‘Sumnam āpa’ constitutes the common property. Perhaps even ‘haviṣmān’ is to be added to it.

(79) उद्वी पृक्षागो मधुमन्त ईरते ॥

स्वर्णं शुक्रं तन्वन्त आ रजः ॥

IV. 45. 2b,d.

‘Your mighty horses laden with sweetness rise upwards, spreading themselves over the mid-region like the bright (light of the) sun.’

'Rajah ā tanvantah' expresses the common property. That 'śukram' is an adjective of 'svar' (and not of 'rajah' as sāyana takes it) is clear from II. 2. 7d and X. 43. 9d. For the simile, cf. I. 84. 1.

(80) गवां न सर्गां वृषसौ जरन्ते ।

IV. 51. 8d.

'The dawns wake up early like the herds of cows.'

'Gavām sargāh' is the upamāna, here as in the next number. 'Sarga,' from $\sqrt{\text{srj}}$, originally means 'swift movement'. Here, however, it secondarily means 'herds with swift movements'. 'Jarante' probably constitutes the common property, or perhaps 'bhadrah' is to be supplied from the next number.

(81) प्रति भद्रा अदृक्षत् गवां सर्गा न रुदन्तः ॥

IV. 52. 5ab.

'The rays of the Dawns are seen charming like the herds of the cows.'

'Bhadrah prati adrksata' constitutes the common property. *Na* here comes after both the words which constitute the upamāna because of the metrical difficulty. Its proper place is between the two; see e.g. No. (80).

(82) सम्यक् स्रवन्ति सरितो न धेनाः ॥

IV. 58. 6a.

'[The streams of ghee] flow charmingly like the fertilizing rivers.'

'Dhenāh saritah' is the upamāna. The upameya is 'ghṛtasya dhārāh' from the last verse. They are praised as identical with the prayers themselves in the hymn. See IV. 58. 5a and 11c.

(83) पतयन्ति यद्वाः...घृतस्य धारा अरुषो न वाजी ॥

IV. 58. 7bc.

'The active streams of ghee gallop forward like a bright horse!'

'Aruṣo vāji' is the upamāna. 'Patayanti' is the common term.

(b) SIMILES WITH *iva*.

(84) अस्य श्रेष्ठा सुमनस्य सुहृद्...स्यार्हा देवस्य सुहनेव धेनोः ॥

IV. 1. 6 ad.

'The appearance of this lovely god is superior and covetable like the gift of a cow.'

'Dhenoh mamhanā' means a gift consisting of a cow and is the upamāna in the simile. Compare for a similar use of the genitive (i.e. to express an object instead of the subject) in connection with 'mamhanā': V. 16. 4ab (adhā hi agne eṣām suviryasya mamhanā:—Let these patrons of ours have your gift of good strength, oh Agni!). For the other simile in the stanza, cf. No. (42) above.

(85) सदा रण्वः पितुमतीव संसत् ॥

IV. 1. 8d.

'The god Agni is always pleasing like a gathering (house) filled with food.'

'Pitumatī saṁsad' is the upamāna. 'Saṁsad' is derived from 'sam + √sad' and means in most passages 'company', 'association', 'gathering', etc. Here it seems to mean 'a house'. It has perhaps this same meaning at VIII. 14. 15. For the same simile, cf. I. 144. 7d (raṇvaḥ . . . pitumān iva kṣayaḥ) and IV. 16. 15d (No. 136 below).

(86) चित्तिमर्चिति चिनवद्विद्वान्पुष्टेर्वीता वृजिना च मर्तान् ।

IV. 2. 11 cd.

'May the wise god discriminate between knowledge and ignorance, between (honest and dishonest) men as between good and bad backs (of horses).'

'Vitā prsthā' and 'vrjinā prsthā' is the common upamāna for the two upameyas, i.e. 'cittim acittim', and '(vitān vrjinān) martān', occurring in the simile.

The poet evidently uses 'vitā and vrjinā' as the adjectives of 'prsthā' primarily, but he also intends them to be used with 'martān'; cf. e.g. IV. 1. 17d; VI. 51. 2c; VII. 60. 2d, where we get the same expression, i.e. 'ṛju mar-teṣu vrjinā ca paśyan', which ought to be construed as 'mar-teṣu ṛju vrjinā ca (janimāni) paśyan'. Properly speaking, even here 'ṛju and 'vrjinā' seem to have been originally conceived as adjectives of 'martān' but the collective nature of 'martān' at the back of the speaker's mind must have affected the gender of these adjectives *when actually used*. The adjectival use of 'vrjina' in many Rgvedic passages, where we must supply 'marta' or 'jana' as its substantive leads to the same conclusion; e.g. cf. VI. 51. 13; VII. 104. 13; X. 87. 15; V. 3. 11; VIII. 67. 9. The implied contrast between 'ṛju' and 'vrjina' at IX. 97. 43 and IX. 97. 18 also shows the same.

The same comparison in a slightly different form is employed again at X. 89. 3c. 'Vi cinavat' expresses the common property.

(87) [ओक्रो न] रण्वा सुदृशीव पुष्टिः ।

IV. 16. 15d.

'(Indra is beautiful) like beautiful and attractive prosperity, [like a house]'.
[like a house]'.
'Indraḥ' has to be supplied as the upameya in the simile. The common term also is apparently dropped; however, as a matter of fact, 'raṇvā' expresses the common property (cf. however, II. 4. 4; I. 66. 1; VII. 20. 7; I. 129. 7, etc.), but has received the gender of the upamāna against the general practice of the Rgvedic poets. Cf. No. (42) above. For a deity compared with 'puṣṭi,' etc., cf. I. 65. 3; 66. 1 (citrā rayiḥ) etc., VI. 55. 3 (vasoḥ rāśiḥ); also see No. 136.

(88) विश्वधनुस्सर्गिणोऽग्नौ योतते स्तोतारं मघवा वसौ धातुः ॥

IV. 17. 13cd.

'Maghavā, who is the breaker (of everything) like the Heaven armed with thunder, places his singer in the midst of riches.'

'Āsanimān Dyauh' is here the upamāna as is clearly shown by the position of 'iva' and by I. 143. 5; 176. 3 (divyā āsaniḥ). At VI. 18. 10b again, Indra's weapon is compared with the 'āsani'.

(89) सुत्रा ते अनु कृष्टयो विश्वा चक्रेव वावृतुः ॥

IV. 30. 2ab.

'Your people indeed follow (you) as all the wheels (follow the horses).'

In this passage, 'viśvā cakrā' is the upamāna and *iva* comes at the end of both the words, owing to metre. Naturally, I do not construe this as a partially expressed (Ekadeśavivarti) upamā since I do not consider *te* as an accusative. I rather take it as a genitive (see Oldenberg, *Noten*, I. pp. 25-29). No doubt we ultimately supply 'tvām' and 'āsum' (cf. above No. 1 and IV. 31. 4) as the subordinate upameya and upamāna respectively; but then these are not implied by the force of the partially expressed *upamā*, but by the force of the partially expressed *sentence* itself. The upamā so far as it is expressed is *complete*. The incomplete *vākya*rtha, however, leads to the implication of 'tvām', which (implied) 'tvām' then further leads to the implication of a corresponding upamāna, i.e. 'āsum' etc. 'Anu vavṛtuḥ' expresses the common property.

(90) अस्थुर चित्रा उषसः पुरस्तान्मिता इव खर्वोध्वरेषु ॥

IV. 51. 2ab.

'The beautiful dawns have stood up in the East, like the sacrificial posts erected at sacrifices.'

'Mitāḥ svaravaḥ' is the upamāna, and 'asthuḥ' expresses the common property.

(91) एते अर्षन्त्यूर्मयो घृतस्य मृगा इव क्षिपणोरीषमाणाः ॥

IV. 58. 6cd.

'These streams of ghee swiftly flow forth, like the deer running away from the hunter.'

'Kṣipāṇor īsamānāḥ mṛgāḥ' is the upamāna; cf. X. 51. 6d. The 'ūrmi's are compared with the deer *in a particular state*. The suggestion of a word in the upameya *vākya* corresponding to 'kṣipāṇoḥ' is certainly not intended; for if at all any such word is to be supplied, it must be 'agneḥ' (ghee is melted by heat and then flows in streams) but we know that the 'ūrmi's' are not running *away* from Agni through fear, but *towards* him through affection! (cf. v. 8 of the same hymn). I consequently do not take this as an Ekadeśavivartini upamā, but merely as a simple (Niraṅga) one with a qualified upamāna.

(92) सिन्धोरिव प्राध्वने शूघनासो वातप्रमियः पतयन्ति यद्वाः ।

घृतस्य धाराः.....

IV. 58. 7abc.

'The active streams of ghee rush onwards, surpassing even the wind (in speed: lit. 'harming the wind'), like (streams of water) dashing down quickly over the sloping region of a river!'

'Sindhoḥ prādhvane śūghanāsaḥ' is the qualified upamāna, for 'ghṛtasya dhārāḥ'. 'Vātapramiyāḥ patayanti' expresses the common property.

I supply 'ūrmayah' after 'śūghanāsaḥ' in *a* from the last stanza (IV. 58. 6) and this is supported by I. 44. 12; IX. 80. 5. Perhaps our 'śūghanāsa ūrmayah' corresponds to 'kṣoda' at I. 65. 3; VII. 95. 1, etc. Accordingly, I derive 'śūghanāsaḥ' from 'āsu + $\sqrt{\text{han}}$ '. The first letter is dropped and the second lengthened as in 'śūkr̥tāsaḥ' at I. 162. 17 (cf. also 'ākenipāsaḥ = keni-pāsaḥ IV. 45. 6; X. 44. 4). For 'sindhoḥ prādhvane', I compare 'sindhoḥ pravaṇe nimne' at IX. 69. 7a.

(93) कन्या इव वह्नुमेतवा उ अञ्ज्यञ्जाना अग्नि चाकशीमि ॥

IV. 58. 9.

'I see them (i.e. streams of ghee) beautifully decorated like the brides going to their nuptial procession!'

The word 'abhicākaśīmi' shows that *iva* is here employed to convey an Utprekṣā rather than a simile. The streams are *imagined to be* beautifully dressed brides going to their nuptial procession (Agni is the bridegroom; cf. IV. 58. 8ab). 'Añji añjānā' cannot be separated from 'vāhātum etavai' and thus belongs to the upamāna alone. It cannot be construed, therefore, as a common term and hence upamā seems improbable.

GROUP IV. SIMPLE SIMILES WITH A SIMPLE UPAMĀNA.

(a) Similes with *iva*.

(94) आ यूथेव क्षुमति पुरवो अरुयदेवानां यज्जनिमान्त्युग्र ॥

IV. 2. 18ab.

'He (i.e. the leader of the Āngirasas or Brhaspati) saw herds as it were of cattle in (that cowstall of Vala) filled with food, when oh fierce one, the godly races were by his side to help him!'

The accent of 'akhyat' shows that *a* and *b* do not form one clause. 'Paśvo yūthā' thus cannot be an upamāna for 'devānām janimā'. Hence I take *iva* as expressive of an Utprekṣā and not of an Upamā. I supply 'ūrve' after 'kṣumati' and take Brhaspati or one of the Āngirasas (cf. III. 31. 7) as the subject of 'akhyat'. 'Devānām janimā' refers probably to Indra with Maruts and Agni himself (though the epithet *ugra* also refers to him) mentioned in the last stanza (i.e. IV. 2. 17). That 'paśvah' is genitive and goes with 'yūthā' is clear from V. 31. 1c; VI. 19. 3c; also VI. 49. 12b; VIII. 4. 20d; IV. 38. 5d.

(95) प्रावेव सोता मधुसुचमीळे ॥

IV. 3. 3d.

'Whom the priest (the Sotā) praises while pressing Soma, like the pressing stone.'

'Sotā' is the priest who presses the soma juice; cf. VII. 22. 1c; 92. 2a, c. 'Madhusut īde' is probably the common property; cf. X. 64. 15cd; VII. 22. 4ab. etc.

(96) ग्राहि राजेवामवा इभेन ॥

IV. 4. 1b.

'Go forth like a king, powerful and with *ibha*!'

The meaning of 'ibha' is uncertain. At I. 84. 17, it is mentioned as a covetable possession along with 'toka' and 'rai'. At I. 65. 4, Agni devouring

fuel (vanāni) is compared with a king enjoying his 'ibhyas'; 'ibha' however, is used as an adjective of Tugra, a king obviously, at VI. 20. 8c and of a 'suvrataḥ rājā' at IX. 57. 3. Has it anything to do with $\sqrt{b\bar{h}ā}$ 'to shine'? Anyhow 'amavān ibhena' seems to constitute the common property; cf. (Rajānā iva tveṣasamīdrso naraḥ) I. 85. 8d; (evā rājeva kratumān amena) IX. 90. 6a; (Rājeva yudhvā) X. 75. 4c; (Rājeva suvratāḥ) IX. 20. 5a; IX. 57. 3.

(97) यदुस्रियाणामपु वारिवु वन ।

IV. 5. 8c.

'When they (i.e. the Aṅgirasas) flung open (the stall) of the cows like an enclosed treasure!'

I take 'Aṅgirasah' as the subject of 'apa vran' and supply 'ūrvam' after 'usriyānām' as the upameya for 'vār'; cf. V. 29. 12 (gavyam cid ūrvam . . . naraḥ śaśamānāḥ apa vran) also V. 30. 4 (Vido gavām ūrvam usriyānām) and VII. 16. 7; X. 108. 8. Lastly, I take 'vār' in the sense of 'enclosure' (from \sqrt{vr}) or 'enclosed treasure' for which I compare I. 132. 3 (R̥tsya vār asi kṣayam); X. 93. 3 (devānām vār mahāḥ) and IV. 21. 8 (vi yad varāṁsi parvatasya vṛṇve). 'Varas' in the last passage is the same as our 'vār'. In the stanza under discussion, I think *b* and *c* refer to the Aṅgirasas, while *d* refers to Agni.

(98) ऊर्ध्वं भानुं सदितेवाश्रेत् ॥

IV. 6. 2c.

'The God (Agni) has assumed his upgoing lustre like Savitā.'

For 'ūrdhvam bhānum, cf. IV. 13. 2 (No. 5) and X. 3. 2c; 'aśret' is the common term.

(99) स विप्रश्चर्षणीनां शर्वसु मानुषाणाम् । अति क्षिप्रेवं विध्यति ॥

IV. 8. 8.

'He, the singer-poet of the people, of men, pierces (the demons) with his power, like powerful bows.'

'Vidhyati' or 'ati vidhyati' means 'pierces through and through'. We have probably to supply 'rakṣāṁsi' as the object of the verb; cf. IV. 4. 1d & 5a; I. 86. 9; X. 87. 4, etc. Similarly we should supply 'dhanūṁsi' after 'kṣiprā' and compare II. 24. 8 (kṣipreṇa dhanvanā) and IX. 90. 3 (kṣipradhanvā).

'Kṣiprā (dhanūṁsi)' is the upamāna for 'saḥ', which is the upameya and is described in *ab*. 'Ati vidhyati' expresses the common property. Oldenberg's suggestion (Noten, I. p. 274) to construe 'kṣiprā' as an instrumental case and an upamāna for 'śavasā' ('He pierces the foe with his power as with a fast bow') is I think rendered improbable by the position of 'mānuṣāṇām' which describes 'sa' and not 'śavasā'. This shows that at the time of composing the 3rd line, which contains the upamāna, 'sa' was more prominent than 'śavasā' in the poet's mind and, therefore, it must have been conceived as the upameya by him.

(100) दविध्वतो रुदमयः सूर्यस्य चर्मैवाधुस्तमो अप्स्वन्तः ॥

IV. 13. 4cd.

'The violently shaking rays of the sun have blown off the darkness into the waters (of the ocean) like a piece of skin.'

'Carma' is the upamāna for 'tamas' and 'adhuḥ' expresses the common property, suggesting the lightness of the task. This same upamāna is used for the same upameya for a different common property, i.e. 'surrounding', 'encompassing', 'covering up' (sam+ $\sqrt{\text{vyac}}$) at VII. 63. 1d.

101) परिं त्रिविष्ट्रध्वरं यात्यग्नी रथीरिव ॥

IV. 15. 2ab.

'Agni goes round the sacrifice thrice, like a charioteer.'

'Pari yāti' expresses the common property. The upamāna 'rathih' usually suggests 'ease, grace and absence of trouble in movement'. cf. III. 3. 2b; II. 39. 2a; VIII. 95. 1a; VII. 95. 1c and IV. 19. 5b. The same is true for the upamāna 'rathah'; see below No. 105. Also compare IV. 6. 4cd for the 'paryagnikarāṇa' described in our stanza, i.e. IV. 15. 2.

102) संसात्युक्थमुचनेव वेधाः ॥

IV. 16. 2c.

'The priest may sing the hymn like Uśanā.'

'Vedhāh' is the ukthaśāsa priest. He is compared with the ancient ukthaśāsa priest Uśanā, for whom see IX. 97. 7; IV. 26. 1; (kavir Uśanā); I. 83. 5 (Uśanā kāvya); 121. 12; VIII. 23. 17; VI. 20. 11 and I. 51. 11, etc.

(103) अ्वद्यमिव मन्यमाना गुहां करिन्द्रं माता ॥

IV. 18. 5ab.

'Indra's mother concealed him, thinking him to be like a stigma, an unspeakable thing!'

Very probably *iva* here is expressive of a saṁbhāvanā or Utprekṣā as is shown by the $\sqrt{\text{man}}$. In that case the translation should be:—'Indra's mother concealed him considering him as if he were a disgrace to her!'

(104) एता अर्षन्त्यललाभवन्तीर्दृतावरीरिव संक्रोशमानाः ॥

IV. 18. 6ab.

'These rivers, who were formerly crying, now rush forth (joyfully) making a gurgling sound like experienced ladies.'

I take 'alalābhavantīh' alone as the common property expressing delight and 'saṁkrośamānāh' as an adjective of 'etāh' only. We must supply some word like 'yuvatīh' after 'rtāvarīh' in view of III. 56. 5 (rtāvarīh yōśanāh) and IV. 19. 7 (yuvatir ṛtagūh). Formerly, i.e. before Indra's help, the rivers were crying but afterwards they produced a deep gurgling sound indicating joy.

(105) रथा इव प्र ययुः साकमद्रयः ॥

IV. 19. 5b.

'The rocks (i.e. the mountain-streams) moved forward together like chariots (i.e. persons borne on them).'

For the interpretation of the stanza, see above No. (36). For the same simile, cf. IX. 69. 9b; VII. 74. 6ab; VIII. 3. 15d; IX. 10. 1a. In all the passages, the common property is 'quick and easy movement'. See above No. 101.

(106) शूग्रीवं वज्रिन् ... त्वया वयमर्यं आर्जिं जयेम ॥

IV. 20. 3cd.

'May we win the prize of our enemy like a gambler, through you (as our companion), oh wielder of the bolt!'

'Arya ājim jayema' expresses the common property. The use of the word 'āji' is interesting. It seems to have been used in its original sense of 'something which is to be won' (from a+√ji) and not in the later sense of 'a battle or a race, where something is to be won' in our passage as also in IV. 24. 8 and IX. 32. 5 (hitam ājim=dhane hite of I. 40. 2; 116. 15; 132. 5 &c.). For 'arya ājim', cf. IV. 24. 8 and 'aryaḥ vājam sanema' of I. 73. 5c.

(107) अहन्नहिमरिणात्सुत सिन्धूनपावृणोदपिहितेव खानि ॥

IV. 28. 1cd.

'He killed Ahi, set free the seven rivers, and opened up their doors which were closed as it were!'

Here we have an Utprekṣā as is evident from the adjective 'apihitā' which is obviously used of 'khāni' and not of any different word intended as the upamāna for it by the poet. Compare e.g. I. 32. 11c (apām bilam apihitam); 51.4 (apām apidhānā avṛṇor) and IV. 28. 5; for the 'khāni' of the rivers which were opened up by Indra, cf. II. 15. 3b; V. 32. 1a; VII. 82. 3a &c.

(108) सहस्राणि शतावधीः । अधि पञ्च प्रधीं रिव ॥

IV. 30. 15bc.

'You smashed one hundred thousand and five more (of the Dāsa's warriors) like the spokes of a wheel!'

'Avadhiḥ' expresses the common property and suggests the *perfect case* with which the warriors were killed. For the smashing of a 'pradhi', cf. X. 102. 7a; 138. 6d.

(109) प्रवता हि कर्तूनामा हा प्रदेव गच्छसि ।

IV. 31. 5ab.

'You come to us on the slope of our pious wills as on foot!'
(as if on foot!)

'Ā gacchasi' expresses the common property; 'kratūnām pravat' is the upameya which is compared with 'pad', thus suggesting *ease* and *naturalness*. The idiom 'pravatā √yā' seems to be used in RV. to signify 'go with ease and naturalness'; cf. I. 35. 3 (pravatā yāti haribhyām); 177. 3 (haribhyām yāhi pravatā); III. 30. 6 (pra etu pravatā haribhyām); IV. 38. 3 (anu prava-teva dravantām); VIII. 6. 34. 13. 8; IX. 24. 2 (āpo na pravatā yatīḥ); IX. 6. 4 (āpo na pravatā saran); X. 4. 3 (dhanor adhi pravatā yāsi) &c. Also cf. V. 31. 1 (indro rathāya pravatām kṛnoti).

In our passage, 'pravatā' is to be construed with 'kratūnām'. It is also possible that *iva* expresses an Utprekṣā as the expression 'padeva' occurring elsewhere shows: II. 39. 5 (pādeva no nayatam vasyo acchā); V. 67. 3 (vratā padeva sāscire); VIII. 12. 31 (suṣṭutim vipra iyarti padeva pipratim pra adhware:— 'At the sacrifice, the priest sends his hymn which carries us safely as it were on foot!) To be led or to go through a river or a danger on foot is surely felt more natural. It signifies confidence, surety and naturalness as

against the diffidence, uncertainty and unnaturalness involved in the other process!

(110) अस्मभ्यं ताँ अपावृद्धिं व्रजौ अस्तैव गोमतः ॥

IV. 31. 13ab.

‘Fling open those stalls of cows for us like an archer.’

The adjective ‘sūrah’ of ‘astā’ is probably intended: cf. IV. 36. 6; I. 70. ; VI. 64. 3.

Here ‘gomataḥ vrajān apāvṛdhi’ expresses the common property. The *pamāna* finds itself embosomed within it. The reason appears to be a psychological one. The chief thing in the *sādhāraṇa dharma* is ‘vrajān apā vṛdhi’; ‘gomataḥ’ is comparatively unimportant and this is why it is mentioned last of all. This is also the reason why the hyperbaton or inversion of the usual order of the adjective and the subst. (gomataḥ and vrajān) has occurred here; cf. Bergagne, Syntax, p. 236. (Annals B.O.R.I., vol. 16.)

(111) अस्माकमुत्तमं कृधि श्रवो देवेषु सूर्य । वर्षिष्टं द्यामिवोपरि ॥

IV. 31. 15.

‘Take our good name high up among the gods, oh sun, to be lofty like the heaven itself.’

‘Uttamam kṛdhi’ is the common property. For ‘uttme divi’. cf. V. 80. 6.

(112) कनीनकेवं विद्वे नवै द्रुपदे अर्भके ॥

वभ्रू यामेषु शोभेते ॥

IV. 32. 23.

‘The two tawny horses, when yoked to the new, small and firm wooden yoke, look lovely like a girl.’

In spite of the very obscure nature of the stanza, it is clear that the ‘babhrū’ horses are compared with a ‘kanīnakā’, whatever the word means. I follow Sāyana in the interpretation of *ab*; only I take the ‘new yoke-pole’ of the chariot as belonging to *the poet himself* and not to Indra as Sāyana has it. The last three stanzas of this hymn are universally admitted to be a ‘dānastuti’ of one ‘Goṣaṇo Napāt’ who was the patron of our poet. The gift probably consisted of a few cows (v. 22), a pair of beautiful brown ponies, and very naturally also a small chariot. The mention of the two horses, their ‘yāma’ before and after daybreak—all this leaves no doubt that a small chariot was included in the gift. This chariot was newly and firmly built and this is in all probability alluded to in the three adjectives used in *ab*. ‘Kanīnakā’ is only a simple *upamāna* (sympathetic dual is expected; see note on No. 25, but it is not used here). ‘Śobhete’ expresses the common property. To the poet, the beautifully trotting ponies look charming like a playfully bouncing girl!

(113) प्र ऋभुभ्यो दूतमिव वाचसिष्ये ॥

IV. 33. 1a.

‘I send forth my hymn to the R̥bhus like a messenger.’

For the same simile, cf. I. 173. 3d.

(114) पुनर्ये चक्रुः पितरा युवाना सता यूपैव जरुणा शयाना ॥

IV. 33. 3ab.

‘Those who made young once more their aged and worn out parents lying low like the sacrificial posts!’

I take both ‘sanā’ and ‘jaraṇā’ as the epithets of ‘pitarā’ alone; cf. e.g. IV. 36. 3 (jivri sanājurā pitarā).

The ‘yūpā’ in the upamāna are the sacrificial posts (i.e. the logs of wood) severed from the trunks of the trees and laid low on the ground for drying up before being erected at sacrifice. *Old used Yūpa’s* are not probably meant. The poet has evidently in his mind the future erection of the Yūpas corresponding to the rejuvenating of the parents now lying down. Yūpā is an example of a sympathetic dual; see No. 25. ‘Śayānā’ is the common term.

(115) विभ्राजमानाँश्चमुसौ अहेवावेनुत्त्वष्टा चतुरो ददृश्वान् ॥

IV. 33. 6cd.

‘Tvaṣṭā did like them when he saw the four cups shining like days.’

‘Vibhrājamānān’ expresses the common property; ‘ahā’ is the upamāna. Compare VIII. 96. 19b (yo aheva revān).

(116) ये देवागो अभवता सुकृत्वा रथेना इवेदधि दिवि निषेद ॥

IV. 35. 8ab.

‘Who became gods by their skilful work and dwelt in the Heaven like eagles.’

‘Adhi divi niṣeda’ expresses the common property.

(117-118) यं सीमन्तुं प्रवतैवु द्रवन्तुं विश्वः पूरुमेदति हर्षमाणः ॥

पृष्ठमिष्ट्यन्तं ... वातमिव ध्रजन्तम् ॥

IV. 38. 3.

‘All Purus feel greatly delighted in him, i.e. Dadhikrā, who runs speedily as if on a slope and moves on ceaselessly like wind!’

‘Pravateva dravantam’ is undoubtedly an Utprekṣā. For ‘pravatā √yā (=dru)’, cf. above Note on No. (109). ‘Dhrajantam’ expresses the common property in the second simile, and Vāta is the upamāna, for which compare VII. 36. 3a. Sometimes ‘śyena’ is used as the upamāna for this same property: cf. I. 165. 2; IV. 40. 3. Also see No. 73 above for the other portion of the stanza.

(119) इन्द्रमिवेदुभये विह्वयन्ते ... दृधिक्राम् ॥

IV. 39. 5.

‘Both parties call upon Dadhikrā as they do upon Indra.’

‘Ubhaye vi hvayante’ is the common property; cf. III. 32. 14d; VII. 82. 9c; 83. 6a, etc.

20) उत स्मास्य ... अनुवाति प्रगर्धिनः ॥

इत्येनस्यैव ध्रजंतो अंकुसं परि दध्मिक्काव्णः ... ॥

IV. 40. 3.

‘And the wind blows after the legs of this greedy Dadhikrā, ho moves forth ceaselessly like an eagle!’

‘Dhrajatah’ is the common property; see above No. 118. Also cf. No. 1 above for the other part of the stanza and the meaning of ‘aṅkas’.

121) सा नो दुहीश्रवसेव गल्ली सहस्रधारा पयसा मही गौः ॥

IV. 41. 5cd.

‘May that cow with a thousand streams (of milk) i.e. the hymn, feed us milk, after going (to you two), as to two pasture lands!’

‘Yavasā’ (two pasture-lands) is the upamāna (an example of a sympathetic dual; see Note on No. 25). I am inclined to take the word as accusative dual in spite of the neuter gender of it in other places. I think, it got the masculine gender under the influence of the gender of the upameya, *indrāvaruṇā*, with whom it is fancied to be identical. We have thus rather a *Utprekṣā* than a simile. Sāyana (and Geldner? see Trans. p. 427: He construes this as an *utprekṣā*) indeed construes ‘yavasā’ as an instrumental; but the following ‘gatvī’ shows that it is an accusative and the dual upameya shows it to be rather dual.

It is to be noted that in the first half of the stanza, the hymn was merely compared with a cow (cf. No. 25 above); here it is identified with it. It is therefore natural that *indrāvaruṇā* are fancied to be two pasture lands rather than compared with them.

These two lines are repeated at X. 101. 9cd, obviously from our passage. Consequently the dual ‘yavasā’ has not got any significance there, the upameya being the plural ‘devāḥ’. The gauḥ is still of course the ‘dhi’ as in our passage and this fact accounts for the blind reproduction. At X. 133. d, the last line alone is again reproduced; even there the ‘gauḥ’ is the prayer. Compare also X. 74. 4d.

122) युवामिच्छवसे ... वृणीमहे ... पितरेव शंभू ॥

IV. 41. 7.

‘We choose you alone for protection, who are benevolent like two fathers.’

The comparison of a deity with *pitā* is very common in the RV. The point of comparison is ‘kindness’, ‘approachableness’, etc., cf. I. 1. 9; III. 49. 3; VI. 52. 6; VIII. 48. 4; X. 33. 3, etc. Obviously, ‘*pitārā*’ in our passage does not include the mother. Here is another example of a sympathetic dual. See above note on No. 25.

(123-124) इमा इन्द्रं वरुणं मे मनीषाः ...

उपेमस्त्युजोद्यारं इव वस्रो रूध्वरिव श्रवसो मिक्षमाणाः ॥

IV. 41. 9acd.

‘These prayers of mine have approached these (īm) Indra and Varuṇa, asking for wealth like attendants (and) for fame like racing mares.’

We have two Upamās here. The common property in the first is 'vasvo bhikṣamānāḥ', the upamāna being 'joṣṭārah' (probably female attendants or are they concubines?). In the second, it is 'śravaso bhikṣamānāḥ' and the upamāna is 'raghvīḥ', i.e. racing mares. For the first simile, cf. I. 95. 6a (ubhe bhadre joṣayete na mene). Ordinarily $\sqrt{\text{juṣ}}$ has the deity as the subject and the 'dhiyah' or 'manīṣāḥ' as the object. For the second simile cf. VII. 90. 7; IV. 5. 13. Sāyana and Geldner, Translation, p. 427, both supply 'dhanikam' as the subsidiary upameya to correspond to 'im'. To me, however, this does not seem to have been intended by the poet. The stylistic peculiarity with which he has composed the two similes as very parallel to one another shows that 'joṣṭārah' is to be construed as a simple (rather than a compound, i.e. sāṅga) upamāna like 'raghvīḥ'. Again, the obviously intended construction of 'bhikṣamānāḥ' with both 'vasvo' and 'śravaso' shows the same.

(125) लघैव विश्वा भुवनानि विद्वान् ॥

IV. 42. 3c.

'Knowing all creatures like Tvastā etc.'

(126) अश्वेव चित्रारुषी ... उषाः ॥

IV. 52. 2a.

'Uṣā is beautiful and red like a mare.'

Perhaps 'citrā' alone is the common property. For the same simile, cf. X. 75. 7d (aśvā na citrā); I. 30. 21 (aśve na citre aruṣi).

(127) क्षेत्रस्य पतिना वयं हितेनेव जयामसि ॥

गामश्च ... ॥

IV. 57. 1abc.

'May we win a cow and a horse through the Lord of the fields as through a friend.'

'Hita' appears to have been used as a substantive as at I. 166. 3c (Maruto hitā iva), in the sense of a friend.

(128) क्षेत्रस्य पते मधुमन्तमूर्ध्नि ... अस्मात् सुध्व ॥

मधुश्चुतं घृतमिव सुपूतं ... ॥

IV. 57. 2.

'Oh lord of the fields! Shake off towards us your sweet wave (i.e. a spring of water) which drops sweetness, and is very pure like ghee.'

'Supūtam' expresses the common property; cf. IX. 67. 12 (suto ghṛtam na pavate). It is probably not intended as an adjective of 'ghṛtam' as in most passages, for which compare under No. (42) above.

(b) Similes with *na*.

9) अश्वो न खे दम् आ हेम्यावान्तमंहसः पीपरो द्वाश्वंसम् ॥

IV. 2. 8cd.

'Carry your worshipper safely through danger like a horse, playing your activities in your own home.'

'Hemyā' is to be derived from \sqrt{hi} . Agni is called 'āśuhemā' at II. 31. 6; 35. 1; VII. 47. 2. On the other hand, the horses of the Aśvinā so called at I. 116. 2. Thus it would seem that 'hemyāvān pīparah' is received as the common property and therefore to construe 'hemyāvān' an adjective of the upamāna, i.e. 'āśva' alone with Sāyanācārya and Geldner would not be correct. This is also clear from the words 'sve dama ā' which go on to the upameya alone and which come immediately after *na*, thus showing that the upamāna consists of 'āśva' alone.

30) पर्यग्निः पशुपान होतृ त्रिविधेति प्रदिवं उरुणः ॥

IV. 6. 4cd.

'Agni, chosen as our priest from ancient days, goes round (the victim) thrice, like a cow-boy.'

'Pradiva urāṇah' is evidently employed as an epithet of the 'Hotā'; the same used of 'Dūtah' at IV. 7. 8c. The reference is to the 'paryagnikarāṇa' of the victim; cf. A.B. II. 11. The aim of this rite is to guard the victim (paśu) and hence Agni is compared with a cowboy (paśupā).

We have to supply 'paśum' (i.e. the victim of the sacrifice) as the object 'pari eti' (and not as the secondary upamāna, subsidiary to 'paśupā' as Geldner, Trans., suggests) with Sāyana. 'Paśūn na gopā' occurring at VII. 3. 3b is in quite a different context. At IV. 15. 2, Agni is said to be going round the 'adhvara' thrice like a charioteer. The latter passage like the one under discussion too contemplates the 'paryagnikarāṇa' of a victim (cf. A.B. VI. 5, where RV. IV. 15. 1-3 are prescribed for the ceremony) and 'adhvaram' very probably refers to the victim itself.

The simple upamāna 'paśupāh' is used at three other places:—I. 114. 3; 144. 6 and X. 142. 2. Everywhere it is followed by *iva* and not *na*. See introduction, para 10. In our passage, metre made the use of *iva* impossible.

(131) द्रवन्त्यस्य वाजिनो न शोकाः ॥

IV. 6. 5c.

'His flames dash forward like race-horses.'

'Vājino' is nom. plural and an upamāna for 'śokāḥ'.

(132) वातस्य मेळि संचत्ते निजुर्वेन आशुं न वाजयते हिन्वे अवा ॥

IV. 7. 11cd.

'When destroying (the woods), he resorts to the strength of Vāta. He (i.e. Vāta) strengthens him like a horse; the horse is urged.'

For the simile, cf. I. 148. 4; VII. 3. 2 (ād asya vāto anu vāti śocih); I. 58. 5 (vātacoditah) and 141. 7; I. 58. 4 (vatajūtah) and 65. 4. For vāta helping forward a galloping horse, cf. IV. 40. 3 (anu vāti pragardhinaḥ aṅkasam pari).

Both Sāyana and Geldner take Agni as the subject of 'vājayate' but this is very improbable as is shown by 'āsum' which is repeatedly used in connection with Agni himself. To imagine this 'āsu' to be Vāta with Geldner would further lead to the complete inversion of the relations of the driver and the driven between Vāta and Agni which seem to be pretty well established in the Rgveda. See the passages quoted above.

For 'āsum na vājayate', cf. ('Bṛhaspate vājaya āsūn iva ājau) X. 68. 2d, and ('Agnim . . . saptim na vājayāmasi') VIII. 43. 25c; also cf. X. 156. 1.

(133) तव...संदष्टिरमे...श्रिये रुक्मो न रोचत उपाके ॥

IV. 10. 5c.

'Your face (or appearance), oh Agni, shines gloriously by our side like a golden ornament !'

(134) तन्नरेपाः...तस्यै रुक्मो न रोचत स्वधावः ।

IV. 10. 6.

'That spotless body of yours shines like a golden ornament, oh self-reliant god !'

For the same simile, cf. VII. 3. 6b; at VI. 51. 1d and VII. 63. 4a, the sun is fancied to be the 'rukma' of the heaven; while Agni is called a 'rukma' shining between the H. and the E. at I. 96. 5. also cf. X. 45. 8a.

'Rukmaḥ' is followed by *iva* at V. 61. 12c; this is probably due to metre. See above Intro. para 10.

(135) इन्द्रं कामा वसूयन्तो अगमन्त्सर्माळहे न सवने चक्रानाः ॥

IV. 16. 15ab.

'Requiring wealth, my desires have gone to Indra longing for him at a sacrifice as in a battle.'

This is one of the clearest passages where *na* may be properly described as used in the sense of a conjunctive particle, i.e. *ca*. The reason why this is so is that in such passages the upamāna is *not extraneous* to the context or aprākaraṇika as it usually is. Both the upamāna and the upameya are equally the matter in hand and the poet desires to speak of both. In our passage, the poet's concern is to show that the common property, i.e. 'the desire to have Indra' is as powerful in the upameya as it is in the upamāna. Its existence in the upamāna is however beyond doubt. For, every one wants Indra on the occasion of a *battle*! But its presence in the upameya is not always so, since some persons are liable to forget Indra at the *sacrifice* when once they gain their objective! Our poet assures Indra that he remembers him at the sacrifice as ardently as he did in the battle. See above note on No. 67, and below Nos. 141, 144.

(136) ओको न [रप्वा सुदृशीव पुष्टिः] ॥

IV. 16. 15d.

'Indra is like a home ! [like pleasant and lovely prosperity].'

'Okas' is here used as an upamāna for Indra as it is used for Agni at I. 66. 2a. Evidently, the common property is implied by the word 'raṇvā' though this is syntactically connected with the upameya alone or perhaps we might say that 'raṇvā' is intended by the poet to express the common property in both the similes. But it receives the gender of the *second upa-*

īna instead of the upameya *Indra*; cf. above note on Nos. 42, 87. I am not inclined to take 'okaḥ' as an accusative of place with Oldenberg, *Noten* I. 278. According to this construction, 'kāmaḥ' are compared with 'puṣṭiḥ' and 'Indram' with 'okaḥ'. Thus there will be only a single simile in *d* and on the presence of the two particles of comparison *na* and *iva* in it becomes explicable.

[37) इषं जरित्रे नद्यो न पीपिः ॥

IV. 16. 21b.

'For the sake of your singer, swell his food-store as the rivers do.'

For the same simile, cf. I. 63. 8b, where 'āpaḥ' is the upamāna for *Indra*. Even in our passage, 'nadyaḥ' (Nom.) is to be taken as an upamāna for *Indra*.

[138-139) गिरिर्न यः स्वतर्वां ऋन्व इन्द्रः..... ॥

आदत्ता वज्रं स्थविर् न भीमः...वसुना नृष्टम् ॥

IV. 20. 6.

'Indra, who is high (souled) and self-strong like a mountain, who breaks open the bolt (i.e. bolt-like stall of Vala) filled with treasures, as he breaks the great (food-store).

For the interpretation of 'Vajra', see above Note on No. (20). The upamāna in the first simile is 'giri' and the common property is expressed by *vataṭvān*' (cf. I. 64. 7b) and 'ṛṣvaḥ' as well (cf. VI. 24. 8c). In the second simile, 'ādartā' expresses the common property and 'sthaviram' which undoubtedly stands for 'sthaviram vājam' is the upamāna. That this latter is true is shown by the root $\sqrt{\text{ā} + \sqrt{\text{dṛ}}}$ on the one hand and by the word 'sthaviram' itself on the other. Both these are frequently associated with 'vājam'; f. V. 39. 3d; VIII. 33. 3b; IX. 68. 7d; X. 69. 3d; and VI. 37. 5a; VII. 93. 2d; I. 1. 11c. The poet seems to have used 'bhīmaḥ', even when he could have used 'vājam' after 'sthaviram', in order to prevent too much softness in the line, which would have otherwise resulted, owing to too many accusatives.

[140) स्वर्णचित्रतममिषु आ गोः ॥

IV. 23. 6d.

'I urge hereward (the son) of the cow (i.e. Aditi), who is most wonderful like the sun!'

Even here, I supply 'putram' after 'goḥ' as in IV. 22. 4 and IV. 22. 8. See above No. 12; *Indra* is meant. 'Citrataṃam' is the common property; f. I. 148. 1d for the same simile.

[141) द्रुगे दुरोणे कला न शतां पुरु सहस्रा शर्वा निर्वहीत् ॥

IV. 28. 3cd.

'He killed many thousands (of Dasyus) that advanced against him (yātām) with his bolt, as he killed those that hid themselves in their difficult forts by means of his policy!'

I take 'kratvā' as the upamāna and 'śarvā' as the upameya. Both these are *prastuta* or are the object of the poet's description and hence *na* has the force of a conjunctive particle. See above Nos. 67, 135. The poet

means to say that Indra employed physical force (*śaru*) against those that advanced boldly against him (*yātām*) and political wisdom or craft (*kratu*) against those that did not offer open resistance (*durge duroṇe vasatām*) but hid themselves in forts. A similar contrast between the two methods of warfare of Indra is also seen at III. 34. 3ab (*a* is physical; *b* is political) and IV. 30. 21 (*hathaiḥ-māyayā*); similarly a contrast between the enemies who boldly attack Indra and those that do not do so is mentioned at IV. 25. 8b (*yāntaḥ avasitāḥ*) and III. 34. 10 (*abhikratavaḥ* and *vivācaḥ*).

(142) त आयजन्त व्रसदस्युमस्या इन्द्रं न वृत्रतुरं...

IV. 42. 8cd.

‘They secured by worship that Trasadasyu for her who kills his enemies like Indra.’

‘*Vṛtraturam*’ expresses the common property. The word *vṛtra*, when in neuter plural, signifies an enemy in general; cf. e.g. IV. 41. 2c.

(143) मक्ष हि ष्मा गच्छथ ईवतो द्यूनिन्द्रो न शक्तिं परितक्म्यायाम् ॥

IV. 43. 3ab.

‘You indeed quickly go to help (men) in a difficulty on such days, like Indra himself.’

‘*Śaktim*’ is an accusative which seems to be used infinitively or perhaps we have to supply an infinitive like ‘*dātum*’ or ‘*vidhātum*’; cf. I. 109. 3b (*Pitrnām śaktim anuyacchamānāḥ*); also cf. I. 31. 18b; 83. 3d; III. 31. 14a, where the ‘*śakti*’ of a worshipper is mentioned. The proper accusative infi. from *√śak* would be ‘*śakam*’. ‘*Śaktim gacchatha*’ expresses the common property.

(144) विहि होत्रा अवीता विपो न रायो अर्यः ॥

IV. 48. 1ab.

‘Accept the oblations; the offerings (*rāyaḥ*) of the enemy are as distasteful as their prayers!’

Both the *upamāna* and the *upameya*, i.e. ‘*vipo*’ and ‘*rāyo*’ are *prastuta* and *na* here has the force of a conjunctive particle; see above Nos. 67; 135; 141.

(145) नू रोदसी अहिना बुध्न्येन सुव्रीत देवी अप्येभिरिष्टैः ॥

समुद्रं न संचरणे सनिष्यवो व्रमेस्वरसो नद्योऽपर्वत्र ॥

IV. 55. 6.

‘May (our priest) praise the divine Rodasī (H. and E.) along with Ahi Budhnya and (other) holy water-deities; the rivers bubbling forth like boiling milk and seeking to win (prosperity for us) in their movements have disclosed (them i.e. Ahi Budhnya and Apyas) as they did the ocean!’

I take ‘Ahi Budhnya’ and ‘Apya’s’ as the object of ‘*apa vran*’. These were brought to light (cf. *arunir apa vran* at IV. 2. 16d) by the rivers in their wanderings (*samcarana*) over the planes for the benefit of mankind, just as ocean was discovered by them while doing the same. *Samudra* is the *upa-*

āna for Ahi Budhnya and Apyas. The common property is expressed by *sanīṣyavaḥ saṁcarāṇa apa vran*’.

C of our passage (which undoubtedly is the earlier one in spite of the metrical irregularity, i.e. 12 syllables in it) is repeated at I. 56. 2. Even here, the poet compares the ‘gūrtayah’ and ‘īṣah’ going to Indra with rivers which go to the ocean, while they seek to win prosperity for man in their movements’. Also cf. II. 11. 1cd. The poet of I. 56. 2 evidently intends *nadyah*’ by ‘*sanīṣyavaḥ*’ as is clear from our passage.

Besides, ‘*saṁcarāṇa*’ is in favour of taking ‘*sanīṣyavaḥ*’ as referring to *he* ‘*nadyah*’: cf. III. 33. 3d (*yonim anu saṁcaranti*); X. 139. 6 (*sasnim avindat carāṇa nadinām*); VIII. 6. 28b (*Sarigathe nadinām*), etc.

I am inclined to take even the word ‘*śravasyavaḥ*’ at I. 48. 3d as referring to ‘*rivers*’ in the light of the explanation given above. The ‘*rathāḥ*’ which hold themselves ready at the time of her ‘*ācarāṇas*’ are compared with the rivers which hold themselves ready at the time of the ‘*ācarāṇas*’ (i.e. the high tides) of the ocean.

(146) यथा ह त्वद्भस्वो गौर्यै चित्पदि प्रितामसुञ्चता यजत्राः ॥

एवो ष्वत्स्मन्सुञ्चता व्यंहः..... ॥

IV. 12. 6abc.

‘Just as you released even that cow whose feet were bound at that time, oh holy gods, so release completely our sin from us.’

The simile is irregularly expressed. This is due to the two meanings which the root $\sqrt{\text{muc}}$ conveys in our passage. In the first half, it conveys its usual sense, i.e. ‘to release a *person* from bondage’; while in the second half it means ‘to release a *bondage* from a *person*’. The poet obviously intends to compare ‘*vayam*’ with ‘*gauri*’ and the common property is expressed by the twice employed ‘*amuñcata*’. A similar confusion is noticeable at VII. 86. 5 where the root ‘*ava + \sqrt{\text{srj}}*’ is similarly used in two senses like our $\sqrt{\text{muc}}$.

(147) नृवत्परिज्मञ्जोनुवन्तु वार्ताः ।

IV. 22. 4d.

‘(And then), the stormy winds roared aloud like heroes, while wandering around.’

(148) यमा मनुष्वत्पुदिवो दद्विध्वे ॥

IV. 34. 3b.

‘Which (sacrifice) you receive (from us) as from Manu, from old days.’

(149) जुह्वे मनुष्वत्...सोमम् ॥

IV. 37. 3c.

‘I offer soma like Manu.’

(150) इन्द्रविष्णू नृवदु शु स्तवाना शर्म नो यन्तम्... ।

IV. 55. 4 cd.

‘Indra and Viṣṇu ! grant us protection, being praised like brave heroes.’

INDEX

(Showing the relation between the original passages from Maṇḍala IV, and the numbers given to them by us.)

1. 3=1; 18	16. 2=61; 102	33. 3=114
1. 6=42; 84	16. 3=6	33. 6=115
1. 8=85	16.11=62	33.10=14
2. 8=129	16.13=7	34. 5=22
2.11=86	16.14=63; 64	35. 8=116
2.14=2	16.15 b =135	38. 2=72
2.17=28	16.15 d =87; 136	38. 3=73; 117; 118
2.18=94	16.19=32	38. 5=74; 75
3. 2=19	16.20=8	38. 6=76
3. 3=95	16.21=137	38. 8=23
3.12=43	17. 4=65	38.10=24
4. 1=44; 96	17.12=33	39. 2=77
4. 4=45	17.13=88	39. 5=119
5. 1=29	17.14.15=34	40. 3=15; 120
5. 3=46	17.16=66	41. 1=78
5. 5=47; 48	18. 5=103	41. 5=25; 121
5. 6=49	18. 6=104	41. 7=122
5. 8=97	19. 2=35	41. 8=38; 39
5.13=3	19. 4=9	41. 9=123; 124
5.15=30	19. 5=36; 105	42. 3=125
6. 2=40; 98	19. 7=67	42. 8=142
6. 3=50	20. 3=106	43. 3=143
6. 4=130	20. 5=10; 68-69	45.2 7 =79
6. 5=131	20. 6=20; 138-39	45.6 7 =79
6. 7=51	21. 1=11	45. 4=16
6. 8=52; 53	21. 2=70	47. 2=17
6.10=54; 55	22. 8=12; 71	48. 1=144
7. 2=41	23. 6=140	51. 2=90
7.11=132	27. 4=37	51. 8=80
8. 8=99	28. 1=107	52. 2=126
10. 1=4; 56	28. 3=141	52. 5=81
10. 3=57	30. 2=89	55. 6=145
10. 4=31	30.15=108	57. 1=127
10. 5=133	31. 4=13	57. 2=26; 128
10. 6=58; 134	31. 5=109	58. 6=82; 91
13. 2=5	31.13=110	58. 7=83; 92
13. 4=100	31.15=111	58. 8=27
15. 2=101	32.16=21	58. 9=93
15. 6=59; 60	33. 1=113	

TOMBS OF SOME PERSIAN ISMAILI IMAMS

By W. IVANOW

Soon after the fall of Maymūn-diz (i.e. the last day of Shawwāl 654 A.H., or the 19th Nov. 1256), the chief fortress of Alamūt, other Ismaili strongholds were captured and ruined by Mongols, and,—as is well known,—their inhabitants were brutally slaughtered. The last ruler of Alamūt, the Ismaili Imam Ruknu'd-dīn Khūrshāh, perished on his way to Mongolia, and his relatives were put to death. In all historical works after this no indication is found relating to the continuation of the family of the Imams, and even Ismailis in general are referred to only during the earliest subsequent period. Later on the term *mulhid*, or 'heretic', which was applied to the sectarians, becomes increasingly vague, and for about six hundred years the sect almost disappears from history's pages. For all these reasons it was regarded in Orientalistic circles as almost an established fact that the family of the Imams was annihilated by the Mongols, and that practically no Ismailis remained in Persia.

Thus, when during the last two decades, or so, genuine Ismaili works became accessible to students, and when it was found that they contained numerous references to the Imams who flourished after the fall of Alamūt, this information was met with much suspicion and distrust. But the gradual study of these new documents left no room for doubt as to the fact that at least many of the Imams, whose names are preserved by oral tradition, really existed. Every student of Islam in mediæval Persia, and of her spiritual evolution, would be tantalized to know more about this mysterious movement which had enough latent force and vitality to survive six hundred years of 'underground' existence. Unfortunately, however, there is very little historical information available. The reasons are many: the precarious existence of the community did not produce the people of superior education and literary tastes who could take up the subject. Ismailis were living in isolated groups, or 'nests', which had little to do one with the other. Their Imams were usually living in the guise of Sufic shaykhs, of whom at that time there was a large number in all Islamic countries. Many of them, especially under the Safavids, held high posts, intermarried with the royal house, etc. References to them *are* really found in the general literature, but the difficulty is that they were known in their public life under quite different names, which the sectarian tradition did not preserve, and now it is not easy to identify them.¹ Their

¹ The well known instance is that of Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh, who came over to India, and settled in Bombay. He was known to the general public simply as the Agha Khan, while on official occasions he was also called Muḥammad Ḥusayni.

Indian followers who periodically used to undertake long and very difficult journeys for paying homage to their Imams, also left very little historical materials. History was never a fancy of the Indian mind; Indian pilgrims were coming to see miracles, to adore their *Guru*; they possessed neither the necessary command of language, nor interest in the history of the country of their spiritual heads. An eminent Indian Ismaili teacher, a man undoubtedly of exceptional abilities, Imām-Shāh, who visited Persia towards the close of the IXth/XVth c., left a book about his experiences.¹ But, to our disappointment, in his work there is not a word about the places which he visited, nor of the village which was the place of the residence of the Imam. His book is entirely devoted to the account of his visit to Paradise, to which he was admitted by the Imam, and his conversations with the ancient saints and his own deceased father whom he met there.²

Persian Ismaili works very often contain mention of this or that Imam; but those works which are known are either dogmatic, or controversial, or poetical in their contents, and therefore do not care about dates. Therefore not much could be expected from purely literary research, and I always dreamt of a possibility of visiting the localities in Persia and elsewhere, in which the Ismailis still live, in order to collect oral tradition, and, if available, survey the remains, such as tombs and other monuments. Such opportunity was at last given to me by some of my friends, in 1937, and I was able to investigate the matter on the spot. It appears that there is no oral tradition worthy of record; but, to my great surprise, there were several monuments of great value in the form of tombstones on the graves of several early Imams. This paper gives a brief account of my finds, which furnish several reliable dates,—so far all that is available. With the help of these, research in Persian mediæval history may elucidate different references and allusions in historical works which without this information would remain obscure.

It is a great pity that the custom, or 'fashion', in designs of tombstones followed fanciful rules which would appear to us utterly illogical. Inscriptions on the tombs of humble and poor people would indicate, e.g., that under it lies a certain Fatima, daughter of so-and-so, of such-and-such village, who died on such-and-such a date, i.e. all particulars about the date and the name of a person, of no importance whatever. But on the tombs of very important people, with their costly and highly elaborate stones, the matter is quite different: the inscription is invariably in the form of an elegy, in which, according to the custom, the name of the person buried there is mentioned in the shortest possible way. No

¹ For details about him cf. W. Ivanow, *The Sect of Imam Shah in Gujrat* (J.B.B.R.A.S., XII, 1936, pp. 39-43). On p. 42, line 8 of that article the name of the village is to be read Kahak, instead of *Kahk*, or the suggested *Kākhak*.

² This work, *Jannat Puri*, was printed in Bombay in the original Gujarati, in 1926.

name of the father, no surnames, etc., are usually mentioned. Even the date of the death is not infrequently given in the form of a poetical chronogram, which may be ambiguous or not quite clear. It is a great disappointment indeed to find instead of the possible precious documental record nothing but the verses from the Coran, precautionary invocations of blessings upon the 'fourteen *ma'sūms*',¹ and a few versified pious platitudes about the frailty of the world, etc.

Before coming to Persia I visited Kerbela and Najaf, in a hope of finding information about the Imams who were buried there. The results were rather disappointing: the cemeteries both in Kerbela and Najaf are run on business lines, and if relatives of those who are buried there cease to take interest, the grave disappears. Walking amongst the tombs I rarely saw any dated inscription earlier than fifty years ago. The majority were quite new, a few years old. It was impossible for me to enter the sacred compounds, and it was also impossible to find a reliable and intelligent man who could go there for me and bring complete information. But it appears from all my inquiries that no Persian Ismaili Imam was buried in Kerbela. In Najaf there are only the graves of Shāh Khalīl-lāh (murdered in Yazd in 1233/1818), and 'Alī Shāh (died in Bombay in 1302/1885),—with their relatives.²

In the valley of Alamut, where one may expect to find the graves of some of the Imams who resided there, no tombs are known. It is quite possible that the contemporaries of the Imams of Alamut, knowing how precarious was their own position, buried their Imams secretly, leaving no outward signs. But it is also possible that such graves existed, but were ruined by the Mongols. In Persia practically every old village always has an *Imām-zāda*, as it is briefly called, really *maqbara'i Imām-zāda*, or a grave of a descendant of the Imams. In Alamut there also are sacred graves of this kind. And it is quite possible that some of them may really contain not the remains of one of the innumerable sons of Imam Rīdā of

¹ The fourteen *ma'sūms*, as is known, are the Prophet, his daughter Fāṭima, and the twelve Imams of the Ithna-'asharis. As is also known, the Ismailis do not recognize as Imams all the Ithna-'ashari Imams after Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq. The appearance of their names is entirely due to the *taqiyya* principle, because it was, and still is, the general practice in Persia to mention these names on all tombs of importance.

² Although the Iraqi government widely advertise the 'attractions' of their country, in the form of its places of antiquarian interest, I found to my expense that the police of Najaf made a point to harrass the visitors. Under the pretext of 'safeguarding' the visitor from the imaginary danger of attack by 'fanatics', they completely prevent the student from coming in touch with the local population. The few with whom an inexperienced stranger may try to have a talk are harrassed by being summoned to the police station, questioned, etc. Those who intend to see not only the outer aspect of Najaf, but would also like to have a talk with some of the numerous Shi'ite scholars residing there, would do well if they secure beforehand unequivocal orders from the central government to the Najaf police to leave them alone, and not to molest their local friends.

Mashhad,—to whom such graves are invariably attributed,—but of some of the Ismaili Imams.

According to Ismaili tradition, the last Imam of Alamut, Ruknu'd-dīn Khūrshāh, anticipating the catastrophe, sent his son and heir designate, Shamsu'd-dīn Muḥammad, to a safe place, and was succeeded by him after his death. There is no direct indication as to the locality in which the Imams were living at that dangerous time. Perhaps the only indirect, and rather elusive testimony is that which can be derived from the intentionally obscure references scattered in the works of the famous Persian poet, Nizārī Quhi-stānī, who flourished towards the end of the VIIth/XIIIth c., and in the beginning of the next. In his work, *Safar-nāma*, in *mathnawī* verse, he gives his route from his native Khūsp and Birjand to the present Southern provinces of Caucasus.¹ It is possible to conclude from what he says that it was there that he met with the Imam. Nothing so far is known as to whether there are any graves of the Imams in that locality.²

How long, and where exactly the early Imams were residing in Adharbayjān,—remains unknown; but it appears that probably about two hundred years later, i.e. by the middle of the ix/xv c., they were settled in the arid and hilly track of the territory lying between Qum and Sultanabad, NW from Isfahan, in the districts of Farāhān and Maḥallāt. The locality is, and always was, very thinly populated, partly occupied by predatory nomad tribes; all this made it suitable for the residence of those who had reasons to avoid much publicity.

The locality is a labyrinth of rocky chains and arid valleys bearing the traces of extensive primæval volcanic activity. The main valley, along the salt river which ultimately reaches Qum, has many large villages, such as Maḥallāt, Nimawar, Diljūn, etc. Towards the North-Western side lies a great plain, a depression between different mountainous regions, the *julgha* of Sultanabad, which in remote past most probably was a great lake. The lowest parts of it are still occupied by a salt marsh. In one of the 'bays' of this ancient lake, in the South-Western corner, at the foot of a steep though not very high range, stands the ancient village of Anjudān,³ which probably was the first place of residence of the

¹ Apparently a unique copy of this work is found in the excellent MS. of the *Kulliyāt* of the poetical works of Nizārī in St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). It still remains unpublished. Cf. W. Ivanow, *A Guide to Ismaili Literature*, p. 105. In his poems he glorifies "Shamsi dīn Nīm-rūz 'Alī", i.e. obviously Shamsu'd-dīn. Apparently the same person is elusively alluded to in his other poems under the name of *Sharafu'd-dīn ḥakīmī 'aṣr*.

² It is interesting that still under the Timurides some obscure ties connected Ismailism with Adharbayjān. Every student knows the story of the famous poet of that period, Qāsimi Anwār, whose real name was Mu'īnu'd-dīn 'Alī (d. 835-7/1431-4). He was a native of that province, and was suspected in being connected with the Ismailis. Unfortunately, the usual biographies are so hopelessly poor in details.

³ On the Survey of India map (16 miles to an inch, ed. 1917), it is called *Injodan*. It is unfortunate that even for those localities which were surveyed

Ismaili Imams in this locality, by the end of the Timuride period. How they spread their influence over other parts of the district, still remains dark. But later on, towards the end of the Safavid period, they most probably resided further East, in Kahak.¹ The latter is at present a small village, occupying a narrow gorge which emerges on the same Sultanabad plain. There is a very difficult rocky path between the two villages, forming a short cut; but ordinarily a circuitous road is used, via Shahwa² or Shāh-sawārān,³ then to Ibrāhīmābād, all three lying on the new Qum-Sultanabad motor road. From Ibrāhīmābād there is about half a day's riding distance to Kahak. From Anjudān to Sultānābād it is about 25-30 miles. To Kahak—about 35-40. A similar distance to Maḥallāt, and from the latter to Kahak—about 25 miles. All these distances are in reality much smaller, if straight lines are considered.

The village of Maḥallāt is a modern place, and apparently has become connected with the Imams during only the latest period, namely the XIXth c.

Anjudān apparently was a large village even long ago, as can be seen from the numerous ruins, especially on the upper part of the slope which it occupies. It has an old mosque, and three mausoleums. Two of them are Ismaili, and one is supposed to be Ithna-‘ashari; the latter seems to be the most modern of these. It has about twenty graves inside, but none of them bear any inscriptions. It is quite possible that it also was a place of burial of Ismailis, but later on was turned into an “Imām-zāda”. Cf. Plate III.

Apparently the oldest mausoleum is an imposing octagonal building with a dom which from outside appears as conical. There are no old graves outside of it. Inside it is whitewashed, and there are no inscriptions. It is popularly called ‘Shāh Qalandar’;—why ‘qalandar’,—no one could explain. It contains the grave of Shāh Mustansir bi'l-lāh the *Second*, well known in the history of the Ismaili propaganda in India. In the middle of the chamber there is a wooden coffer-like ‘box’, exquisitely carved. Most probably it was painted when new, but now it is in a poor state of repair, the colours are gone, and the letters or ornamentation are obliterated in

recently, the information is not made public (if it is utilized at all for those maps which remain confidential). The new editions of maps of Persia not only retain all the mistakes, omissions, and perversions of the old ones, but augment these errors by adding to them ‘scholarly’ appearance, through the introduction of accents on the names. This is apparently done by completely unqualified clerks possessing not even an elementary knowledge of Persian language, grammar, or the geography of the country.

¹ On the same map—Kiagrak (!). Both here and in the vicinity of Anjudān the direction of the hills, etc., are pure fantasy. As usual, many quite large and important villages are omitted. For instance, on the way from Maḥallāt to Kahak there is a large village War, which is much bigger than Kahak. And yet there is no trace of it on the map.

² Shāhveh on the map.

³ Shāhzavarān on the map. The topography of the locality is rather fantastic.

many places. On the top is written: '(this is) the pure, sacred and luminous grave of Shāh Mustanşir bi'l-lāh. By the order and care of 'Abdu's-salām'.¹ From this one would have full right to conclude that this wooden box was erected by the order of Shāh 'Abdu's-salām, the son of Mustanşir, over the grave of this father. A broad panel at the top edge on all sides is beautifully carved with the text of the chapter Yā-sin from the Coran. At the short side, bottom, there is written: 'wrote this the humble slave 'Abdu'l-Jalil . . . (illegible) in 885 (A.H., i.e. 1480)'.² Thus it would be reasonable to infer that this box was erected in 885/1480, most probably soon after the death of Imam Mustanşir, on his grave, by the order of his son and successor.

Not far from the mausoleum of 'Shāh Qalandar', behind the old mosque, there is an old burial ground situated in a garden in the middle of which stands the mausoleum of 'Shāh Gharib', as it is locally called. The place presents the sight of utter desolation and neglect. Excellent carved marble tombstones, some of which are more than three hundred years old, are lying about unprotected from elements, upset, moved from their original places, many of them broken. The mausoleum itself, an octagonal domed structure of the usual pattern, is in a precarious state. Cf. Plate III.

In addition to the grave of Shāh Gharib there are five more graves inside of the building, and several outside, partly in a special adjoining structure, now lying in ruins, and partly just at the sides. Tombstones are fixed in the walls, in a standing position, which better preserves the stones than the usual horizontal one. The central grave has no tombstone, but is covered, as in the mausoleum of Shāh Qalandar, with a *şundūq*, of carved wood. So closely it resembles the first that there can be little doubt that both are the work of one and the same artist. The carvings contain the usual *sūra* Yā-sin, an invocation of blessings upon the fourteen *ma'sūms*, and rhythmically repeating ornament with square svastica-like combination of four words, 'Alī. In one place it is clearly written: 'this is the box (*şundūq*) of Shāh Mustanşir bi'l-lāh, the son of Shāh 'Abdu's-salām. Written on the 10th of Muharram 904' (i.e. the 29th August, 1498).³ The name of Shāh Gharib (which, by the way, undoubtedly is a surname, not a proper name of a person), does not appear anywhere. As there cannot be much doubt about the local

¹ Cf. Plate II and Plate III, 3.

(هذا) مرقد مظهر مقدس نور حضرت شاه مستنصر بالله موجب امر

و اهتمام حضرت عبد السلام

... حرره العبد الضعيف عبد الجليل سابوری بتاريخ سنه خمس

و ثمانين و ثمانمائة

³ هذا صندوق حضرت شاه مستنصر ابن شاه عبد السلام الحسيني

tradition attributing this grave to Shāh Gharīb, the only possible inference is that Mustanşir bi'l-lāh b. 'Abdi's-salām and Shāh Gharīb are one and the same person. This is the most probable, but, of course, it is also possible that either this Mustanşir *the Third*, although he was an Imam, is omitted in the traditional pedigree; or that he was the son of Imam 'Abdu's-salām, but not an Imam himself. Personally I would be inclined to accept the identity of Shāh Gharīb and Mustanşir III.

The traditional version of the sequence of the Imams after Shāh Gharīb is: Nūru'd-dīn (also called Bū Dharr 'Alī), Murād Mirzā, Dhū'l-fiqār 'Alī, Nūru'd-dahr 'Alī, Khalīlu'l-lāh, and Nizār. As the *ṣundūq* on the grave of Shāh Gharīb is dated the 10th Muharram 904, we may believe that he died towards the end of 903/1498. The last Imam, Nizār, as we will see presently, was buried in Kahak, in 1134/1722. Thus we have six generations for about 230 years.

The grave of Shāh 'Abdu's-salām, the son of the first Mustanşir bi'l-lāh, is not known. There are several more graves of different persons in the same mausoleum, but, very unfortunately, their names are given in the same 'poetical' way, isolated, and, certainly, none of them contains any direct indication of the person's being regarded as an Imam. Inside of the mausoleum, beginning from the right corner, opposite the entrance, there are five graves, the tombstones of which are inset in the wall: Mirzā Bāqir (d. 1043/1632-3); *Amīri a'zam akram* Hisāmā (?) Khalīlu'l-lāh *Miri khāsh khaṣā'il*, who died at the age of 68 on the 2nd of Ramaḍān 1043/2-3-1634; Nūri Dahr (d. at the age of 63 in 1069/1658-9); Shāh Khalīlu'l-lāh *the Second* (d. 3rd Dhī'l-hijja 1090/5-1-1680); and Mahīn Mirzā (d. 6th Shawwāl 1081/16-2-1671). Behind the mausoleum, in an additional chamber, now in ruins, there are graves of a certain Ibrāhīm (d. 1069/1658-9) and Nūru'd-dahr Khalīlu'l-lāh (d. the 8th Rajab 1082/10-11-1671). Cf. Plate I, 1.

It is quite obvious that all these persons were members of one and the same family, and that they were descendants of Mustanşir bi'l-lāh (III), who died just before the beginning of 904/1498. It is strange therefore that nobody was buried here for nearly 140 years, which roughly coincide with the rise of the Safawids, the long reign of Tahmāsp, and the brilliant period of 'Abbās I. Most probably the leading members of the family were living elsewhere,—perhaps in the province of Kerman?

Of the names which are found in the traditional pedigree we find here two only,—Nūru'd-dahr and Khalīlu'l-lāh, two times the former, and three times the other. The most valuable is the expression 'Shāh Khalīlu'l-lāh *the Second*' (who died in 1090/1680). If he was the *second*, this clearly implies two things, namely that he was the second in a certain line, and that there was another Khalīlu'l-lāh who was the *first*. Thus it is perfectly certain that he was an Imam. But who was the *first* Khalīlu'l-lāh,—the one who is here called *Amīri a'zam* (d. at the age of 68 in 1043/1634), or Nūru'd-

lāh Khalilū'l-lāh (d. 1082/1671) ?—It seems probable that the last one should be preferred: whenever the father and the son in Persia bear one and the same name, they are often distinguished one from the other by the addition of the words '*buzurg*', or the elder, and '*kūchik*', the younger. In the case of the Imams it would easily be replaced with the terms 'first' and 'second'. It seems more likely that Khalilū'l-lāh (d. 1043/1634) really is *the first*. In this case he may be the same as the Imam called Dhū'l-fiqār 'Alī, because this expression most probably is not an original name, but a honorific surname. If so, he was born about 975/1567. Therefore only about 70 years (from 903/1498) remain for the period of two Imams,—Bū Dharr and Murād Mirzā. It may be added that Imām-Qulī Dizbādī, who used the *takhalluṣ* Khākī, in his poems refers to Imām Nūru'd-dahr, whom he calls the son of Dhū'l-fiqār (314), but in another place—the son of Khalil (274). From this it is quite obvious that Imam Dhū'l-fiqār's original name was really Khalilū'l-lāh. The same poet, who was a contemporary of these Imams, alludes to Anjudān as their place of residence (88).¹ In my introduction to the edition of Imām-Qulī's *Diwān* (p. 13), I suggested that according to the text of the poems it is possible to conclude that Shāh Nūru'd-dahr succeeded to his high office *soon before* 1050/1640. The dates on the graves thus completely agree with this assumption.

There are many old graves in the compound, but the oldest of these seems to be that of a certain Zaynu'd-dīn 'Alī ibn Husayn ibn Khūshnām Angawānī (i.e. Anjudānī), who died on the 1st Rab. I 961/4-2-1554. How excellent it would be if the tombstones on the graves of the Imams would be as precise in their indications as to the name of the person buried there!

There are in Anjudān apparently no other buildings associated with the memory of the Imams. Their palaces are gone long ago, although their site is still shown. At present it is occupied with houses of peasants. Some tanks with borders of hewn stone, and some water channels, are attributed to the activity of the Imams. But, in fact, there are no inscriptions, and it is a common thing in Persia (and elsewhere) that every building of note, the real founder of which is forgotten, is attributed to quite a different person who, for some reason, impressed popular memory much more than the real builder of the monument.

The people of Anjudān, who are Persians, at present have very little connection both with Kahak and Mahallāt. Their chief market is Sultanabad, or even Qum, with which communications (by motor car) are much easier than with the former two villages, situated behind several chains of hills.

Passing to Kahak, one finds it to be a very poor and small village of twenty or twenty-five houses. There are signs, however,

¹ *Diwān of Khākī Khorasani*, ed. by W. Ivanow, Bombay, 1933. The figures refer to the verses, which are numbered from the beginning to the end of the edition.

that formerly it was much bigger. Quite a surprising feature for such a small village is an old caravanserai of the usual Persian type, solidly built, and still in quite good condition. Its presence here is explained by the fact that long ago the Isfahan-Sultanabad road touched Kahak, and thus it was not so completely isolated as it is at present. Cf. Plate V.

Just near it, at the Western end of the village, stands the mausoleum of Shāh Nizār, as it is locally called. The building is of the usual Persian mausoleum type, being composed of several chambers, each containing several graves. Quite an exceptional feature of this small necropolis is the presence of inscriptions in Khojki Sindhi characters, obviously on the graves of the Indian pilgrims who died here,—an exceptionally rare form of link with India. Cf. Plate IV.

As one enters the garden by a rustic looking gate, he finds himself in a compound with several quite modern graves. The building stands on a sort of a platform, erected on the slope of the hill, so that its further side rises some ten feet above the level of the garden. As may be seen on the plan, the building consists of several chambers, as is the usual case with Sufic mausoleums all over Persia. The chambers are open towards the garden, and only a wooden lattice serves as the outer wall. The main chamber,—domed,—in which Aqā Nizār himself is buried, is the one marked with 'B' on the plan. It is whitewashed, and contains no inscriptions. In some niches in the wall there are different objects often found in similar mausoleums, such as a large *pīh-sūz*, or a sort of 'candle stick' of monumental dimensions, in which sheep's fat is burnt; loose leaves of the Coran; a few white stones; a looking glass; and some legs of a wooden camp cot, obviously of an Indian origin.

In the *qibla* wall there are two slabs with inscriptions inset about two feet above the ground. The left one is that of Shāh Nizār himself. In a Persian elegy which is carved on it it is stated that he died on Wednesday the 4th of the month of sacrifice, i.e. Dhū'l-hijja 1134, i.e. the 15th (or really the 14th evening) of Sept. 1722. Unfortunately, no other details are given. In the right corner of the chamber there is another slab, on which it is said that it refers to Mirzā Shāh Khalīlū'l-lāh who died in 1155/1742. Most probably he was the son of Aqā Nizār, but not an Imam, because there is no Imam with that name until the beginning of the XIII/XIXth c. Cf. Plate I, 2.

It is worth noting that the wooden doors which are still in fairly good condition in this chamber, are artistically carved, and dated 1139/1726-7.

The ante-chamber of this room, through which one enters the mausoleum of Shāh Nizār ('A' on the plan), contains six graves out of which four are covered with tombstones bearing inscriptions: Murtadā 'Alī Akbar (d. 1126/1714); Mirzā Tālibā (d. 1122/1710); Sayyid Qabbāl (?) (d. 1111/1699); and Mirzā Sālīh (d. 1117/1705). It is quite possible that these are the tombs of some relatives of Aqā Nizār who died in his lifetime.


The next chamber, the largest, contains about 15 graves, the majority having no inscriptions. Those on which the names of the persons who are buried there are mentioned, are mostly ladies or children, most probably also relatives of the Imam: Fāṭima Sultān Begum, the daughter of *naqībī 'alī-jāh* Sayyid Hasan Bangā (or Yangā ?),—she died on the 26th Rab. II 1165, i.e. 13-3-1753; an anonymous Sayyida, d. 1115/1703; Shamsa, d. the 18th Sha'bān 1139/10-4-1727; Sayyid Ibrāhīm, d. in the same year; two other graves, of children, are dated 1114/1702 and 1129/1717.

Behind this chamber there is a small one, which contains an open grave, covered with a sort of a plain wooden box. A piece of an inscribed tombstone is inset near it in the wall. The fragment does not contain the name of the person, but the date is given as 1155/1742.

The last chamber (D) is a sort of a porch, and is partly divided into two. There are several graves, with and without inscriptions, apparently of servants of the Imams, and not members of their

Approximate plan of the mausoleum of Shāh Nizār in Kahak.

road



garden

family. Some of them belong to Indian followers who most probably died here while on a pilgrimage. Such are those of Aqā Nihāl, dated the 19th Šafar 1135/29-11-1722; Kāmāḍiyā Muḥammad, d. 1209/1794-5; Kāmāḍiyā Dātardīnā Wandānī of the Dar-khāna *jamā'at*, d. 1217/1803.¹ Also the graves of a certain Khwāja

¹ As Khojki type is not available, and, apart from this, very few students can read it, I give these inscriptions in the Nagari transliteration, which was prepared for me, and the quotation translated into English, by my Khoja friends to whom I acknowledge my indebtedness:

धरखाने: जोमेजो खीजमतमे कामरीओ: दातारदीनु भाइ वंदाजी सं.
१८५९ ई: सन १२१७ मी: आषाढ ११ थावर रात

Almās, perhaps a negro slave, who died in 1155/1742, and of a man who was killed by the Afghans in 1137/1725, etc.

There are several inscribed slabs, placed at the edge of the platform on which the building stands. Most probably they are brought here from their original sites elsewhere. They are in a very bad state of preservation. One of them is in Khojki Sindhi: 'Rai Pareo Janguani (died) on the 1st of Posh 1866 (of the Samvat era)', —i.e. 1810.¹

Local inhabitants show the gardens which belonged to the house of the Imam, in which there is a stone platform, made in the form of a large table. It stands in a depression, which, as they say, was on different occasions filled with water so that the *takht*, or platform, would form an island. Aqā Nizār used to sit on it while receiving his guests, who were seated on the other side of the water, amidst flower beds. Cf. Plate V, 2.

On the top of a hill spur which dominates the village on the South, there is an old dilapidated fortified enclosure, of the usual type, originally built of raw stone with clay. Now the clay is washed away, and stones lie in irregular heaps. No inscriptions or any objects of historical interest are found on the spot. It is possible, when looking from the fort down upon the village, to distinguish traces of old foundations. At the entrance of the village there is still a typical 'country gentleman's house', now abandoned and uninhabited, in which until two decades or so ago some relatives of the first Agha Khan were living.

It is obvious that the misfortunes which overtook Persia in the second quarter of the XII/XVIIIth c. and later, and which have thrown the country into a state of prolonged chaos, badly affected the life of the Ismaili community in Kahak and elsewhere. For about seventy years after Aqā Nizār, or even later, the Imams evidently did not reside in these localities. This circumstance most probably explains the fact that although the memory of Aqā Nizār is still preserved by the local inhabitants, they are quite unable to give any particulars about the Imams after him, until the time of Hasan 'Alī Shāh, the first Aqā Khān. They know that the father of the latter was Shāh Khalīlu'l-lāh, who was murdered in Yazd. But nobody could tell me what was the name of the father of this Shāh Khalīlu'l-lāh.

The Imams of the subsequent period so far remain rather shadowy figures. Most probably they occupied the office only for short periods of time, and were not settled at some particular place.

i.e. 'Kamadia Datardina Wandani of Darkhana *jamā'at* reached the presence of the Pir on Thavar night (=Friday) of the 11th Ashad, 1859, according to the Samvat era, or 1217 Hijri'.

¹ राइ: पारेओ: जांगुआणी: सं: १८६६: सीती पोइोजी

i.e. 'Rai Pareya Janguani (died) on the 1st Posh 1866 according to the Samvat era'.

Izār's son and successor appears under the name of Sayyid 'Alī. He was succeeded by Hasan Beg, or Hasan 'Alī Shāh. Tradition takes him an associate of Nādir (1148-1160/1736-1747), and a participant of the famous raid on India (1151/1738). Although this is possible chronologically, the story sounds rather doubtful. He was followed by Qāsim-Shāh, or Qāsim 'Alī Shāh, who in his turn was succeeded by Abū'l-Hasan, or Sayyid Hasan 'Alī.

Some information about the latter can be found in different historical works. Sayyid Abū'l-Hasan Kahakī, as he was called, was for some time the governor of Kerman. I have not so far been able to ascertain the exact dates of his occupation of this post, but it is obvious that this was approximately the last quarter of the XVII/XVIIIth c. Indian tradition gives as the date of his death 1194/1780, and this may be near the truth.

In the Mushtāqiyya in Kerman, which is the mausoleum of the famous Sufi, Sayyid Mushtāq 'Alī, and is a conspicuous landmark in the city, there is an anonymous grave which is supposed to be that of Sayyid Abū'l-Hasan. As is known, Sayyid Mushtāq 'Alī was murdered by fanatical mullas in 1204/1790, for his alleged heretical utterances. The place is a small necropolis, of the usual Persian type, with a garden and rooms for darwishes inside. In the same chamber in which Mushtāq is buried there are several graves, amongst which the most prominent is the tomb of Hāji Mirzā Muḥammad Husayn Khān, the governor of Kerman, who died in Shāhbān 1202, i.e. May 1788. The grave attributed to Sayyid Hasan is situated on the left side from this, nearer to the entrance. It is covered with a greenish marble slab, bearing no inscriptions. It is impossible, indeed, to be quite certain about this half forgotten tradition, which, however, seems to be probable.

It is quite possible that Sayyid Abū'l-Hasan Kahakī was the governor in and about 1175/1761. There is another building in Kerman which apparently is also associated with him. About a hundred yards from the Mushtāqiyya, which stands on the ground which formerly was an extensive cemetery just outside the ancient city walls, there is amongst other graves an octagonal mausoleum, of the usual Persian type. Originally quite imposing, it is now in an utterly neglected condition. Inside below the cornice there is a wide panel containing an elegy in Persian verse, from which it is possible to determine that it was built in 1173/1759-1760, over the grave of Fakhru'z-zamān, the daughter of Sayyid Abū'l-Hasan, who died in 1170/1756-7 in her early youth. Some other people, apparently members of the same family, were later on buried in the same mausoleum. It is really sad to see the condition in which this monument is at present: the graves are desecrated, bones thrown about, the earth dug up, the walls damaged and ready to collapse; and the place is used as a latrine by passers-by. Inquiring into the reason for such a state of things, I found that the municipality (*baladiyya*), in their zeal for 'improvements,' decided to use this 175 years old domed structure for *zūr-khāna*, or training room

for wrestlers, In accordance with their decision, they proceeded with its intended rebuilding; but, after having utterly ruined it, they, about two years ago, abandoned it, and left the mausoleum to the final destruction by the elements.¹

According to oral tradition it appears that while occupying the office of the governors and other high officials in the city and province of Kerman, the family of the Imams owned some landed properties in the city of Kerman, and also in the towns and districts of Shahri Bābak and Sirjān. Visiting these places in December 1937, I found that although in several villages in the vicinity of Shahri Bābak some two hundred families of the Ismailis are still living, there are no monuments or identifiable traces of the time of the Imams, although only 150 years have elapsed. In the town a spacious area is shown which according to oral tradition was the property and the place of residence of the Imams. At present all the houses are gone, and the place is occupied by many families of peasants. A *Ḥusayniyya*² and a mosque are shown. They are supposed to be associated with the Imams, and apparently long ago were quite imposing buildings. At present only the mosque is to some extent preserved; bundles of votive rags tied to some parts of wooden lattice show that in the eyes of the local inhabitants the place still preserves some vestige of sacredness.

No graves of the Imams or members of their families are known in either of the districts, Shahri Bābak and Sirjān. It is quite possible that some of the Imams were buried in Najaf, because this was a gradually growing custom of the time. As is known, the body of Shāh Khalilū'l-lāh, who was killed in Yazd in 1233/1818, was taken to Najaf. His son, the first Agha Khan, Ḥasan 'Alī Shāh, as is known, is buried in Bombay, but his grandson, 'Alī Shāh, is also buried in Najaf.

One of the most interesting parts of Persia, connected with the early period of Ismailism, is Khorasan, and especially Qā'in. Many graves dating from five and more centuries are found in the vicinity. A proper survey of these, before they are destroyed by man and time, perhaps may bring to light some links with the early Imams.


¹ The amount of ruin of the ancient and old buildings in Persia, resulting from the official enthusiasm of the different municipalities, is really appalling. These gentlemen have no sense of proportion, no mercy, no respect for the memory of the historical past. Tombstones from old cemeteries are regularly used for pavements, bricks of ancient monuments are used for municipal buildings, the general appearance and style of the old cities is mercilessly defiled. Only rare exceptions amongst the much boasted 'improvements' are not the vilest forms of destruction. The 'archæological department', headed by European scholars, do their best to save some monuments, but this can be done only with regard to very few buildings. If the 'progress and improvement' policy goes on unchecked for some years, practically all antiquities and buildings of artistic value will be wantonly destroyed in Persia.

² The *Ḥusayniyya* is what in India is called Imambara, i.e. a public open hall, or compound, in which the Shi'ites congregate for witnessing the Muharram memorial plays, and for preaching.

The ancient Ismaili castles, situated immediately South of Qā'in, and further on, on a spur of Kūhi Rich, in the vicinity of Khūsp, preserve no inscriptions, just as similar castles elsewhere,—Alamūt, Shīr-Kūh, Girdkūh (near Damghān), etc. All these castles were not meant for permanent habitation, but only for use in the hour of danger.




No. 1. Inscription on the tomb of Nūru'd-dahr
Khalilu'l-lāh, Anjudān.




No. 2. Inscription on the tomb of Aqā Nizār, Kahak.

(The photographs were taken not from the tombs directly, but from carbon impressions, taken from them.)




Inscription on the wooden *şundiğ* on the grave of Mustanşir bi'l-lâh II, Anjudân.


(The photograph was taken from a carbon impression of the inscription. In the centre of the arch there is a wooden bar, passing through the centre of the cover. The surface is very uneven due to numerous cracks and holes.)




2



4




1




3

- No. 1. General view of Anjudān, from the West.
 No. 3. Mausoleum of 'Shāh Qalandar', i.e. Mustanşir II, Anjudān.


- No. 2. Mausoleum of Shāh Gharīb, Anjudān.
 No. 4. The şundūq on the grave of Shāh Gharīb.




2



4




1




3

- No. 1. Necropolis of Aqā Nizār, Kahak, outside.
 No. 3. Grave covered with a box, Kahak
 necropolis.


- No. 2. Necropolis of Aqā Nizār, Kahak, from inside.
 No. 4. Graves in the chamber in front of the grave
 of Shāh Nizār. Note the old carved door.



No. 1. General view of Kahak, from the old fort. The building in the right corner, front, is the necropolis.



No. 2. The *takht*, or stone platform, in the garden of Shāh Nizār, Kahak.



No. 3. Old caravanserai, Kahak.

AN ISMAILI POEM IN PRAISE OF FIDAWIS

By W. IVANOW

Not only every student of Muhammadan history, but also every educated layman knows the horrible tales about the dreadful assassins who in the xiith and xiiith centuries on many an occasion were responsible for the abrupt end of the career of this or that 'pious and great man'. We possess only histories written by the admirers or dependants of these assassinated 'pious and great men', and the impression may be formed that such acts of terrorism were merely a part of political intrigue, and that those who fell from the daggers of their opponents were all really pious and good. But the same orthodox historians often quite naïvely, amongst the pious acts of their pious patrons, describe revolting crimes perpetrated by them on a grand scale under the pretext of the struggle for the purity of the religion. Whole districts inhabited by hard-working and peaceful Ismaili peasants were from time to time devastated, and all their inhabitants,—men, women, and children, were for no reason slaughtered with the ferocity and brutality which was surpassed only in our own advanced days. All this was often done for no other reason than collecting some miserable booty, or for the self-advertisement of some princes or officials.

Such a small minority as the Ismailis, certainly, could not face the overwhelming forces of the majority, and their only reaction upon these atrocities could be acts of individual vengeance, directed, —quite logically,—against the heads of the enemy. Such things always and everywhere were practised under similar circumstances. In spite of their hatred to Ismailis, the same orthodox historians often do not pass in silence over the heroical behaviour of the *fidawis*, as such emissaries were called. To explain this, historians always recount all sorts of fairy tales about the Ismailis being duped, drugged, etc., by their leaders in their pursuit of different nefarious ends. But apart from fairy tales, there is an important and obvious factor, namely the psychology of the oppressed and persecuted religious minority. It is really remarkable that no other religious sect in the history of Islam can compare with Ismailism in its reactions upon persecution. This reveals the most extraordinary grip exercised by Ismailism over its followers. Moreover, it also reveals a very high level of mental culture, of moral education of the devotees. It is not easy to practice all sorts of austerities for the sake of religion. But to come to a determination to sacrifice one's own life for the cause of the mother community, and to be able to carry out this decision in cold blood, overcoming thousands of obstacles,—this requires not only a fanatic, but also a man of high morale.

All Ismaili works which I had perused heretofore uniformly keep silence on this point. And it was for the first time that in an old manuscript containing a collection of Ismaili poems and treatises, and dating from the xth/xvith c., I found something that may throw light on this matter from the sectarian point of view. It was a poem by an Ismaili mediæval poet Hasan, a *qaṣida*, glorifying the three devout Ismailis who assassinated Ildigiz. This poem, whatever its poetical and artistic merits may be, thus appears to be the most interesting document for the illustration of the psychology of this centuries long struggle, and therefore it deserves being edited and translated here.

It is not clearly indicated to what particular occasion the poem refers. The only prince who was called Ildigiz in the history of Persia was the king of Adharbayjān, the Atabeg Shamsu'd-dīn Ildigiz, the founder of a dynasty which ruled for about a hundred years. But this Ildigiz died peacefully at an advanced age in 568/1173, in Hamadan. Ibn al-Athīr, Rāwandī, and Qazwīnī (*Guzīda*) mention nothing about his being assassinated, or about the Ismailis being in any way responsible for his death. Thus the story most probably refers to the assassination of the son of Ildigiz, Qizil Arslān (582-587/1186-1191). He really was secretly murdered in his palace one night in Shawwāl 587/Nov. 1191 (so according to the *Guzīda*, 475; Ibn al-Athīr gives Sha'bān, i.e. August of the same year). He was found dead in the morning, and, as Ibn Athīr narrates, his murderers remained unknown; suspicion fell on the guards of the palace. But Qazwīnī mentions that the Ismailis were suspected, and the *Baghdādīs* for this reason executed some of the sectarians (476: *ba-sababi qatli ā Baghdādīyān qatli malāḥida kardand*).

If so, how to reconcile the story of the *qaṣida* from which it appears that the king was accompanied by only three horsemen, out of which two fled, and one was killed? It may be a poetical figure: it is difficult to think that a king of the rank of the Atabeg Qizil-Arslān could be surprised at a lonely place, being accompanied by only three attendants. Perhaps these 'three horsemen' in reality were the palace guards mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr,—then the story is quite clear. It is quite possible that these guards were chosen from the higher ranks, 'cavalrymen'. Anyhow, the reference to the assassination of the Atabeg seems to be genuine, and therefore most probably it was not Ildigiz himself, but *Ibn Ildigiz*, Qizil-Arslān, whose great ambition, and constant wars in Māzandarān, inevitably brought him in hostile touch with the Ismaili headquarters in Alamūt.

It is really interesting that the three *fidawīs* who volunteered to undertake such a dangerous and difficult task were all natives of the Southern Khorasan, namely the districts between Qā'in and Birjand. They were neither duped, nor drugged, as the popular stories would expect, but simply selected by the chief *dā'i*,

Muzaffar ibn Muḥammad,¹ from the *markazi n-j-m-n*,—the second word is not quite clear, but most probably is a form of the common word *anjuman*, so altered for the requirements of the metre. There are no indications as to what was this *anjuman*,—assembly, corporation, institution of the devotees? But its *markaz*, or centre, could be some sort of head office, if this term is not here used merely in the sense of the 'chosen and the best men' of their class.

The collection of the poems in this Kerman Manuscript gives sufficient materials for the identification of the author, Hasan, who is not to be confounded with Imam Hasan 'alā dhikri-hi's-salām (the passage cxxi, on p. 102 in my *Guide to Ismaili Literature*, must be corrected accordingly). He was a poet of the time of the successor of this Hasan, Diyā'u'd-dīn² Muḥammad, the *khudāwand* of Alamūt (561–607/1166–1210),—the same Imam whom the Syrian Ismailis, perhaps quite erroneously, regard as one and the same person with their hero, Rāshidu'd-dīn Sinān. In the poems of Hasan the name of this Imam constantly appears as the *mamdūh*, i.e. the person to whom they are dedicated. In the same collection there is another of his *qaṣīdas* beginning with:

Sāhib zamān ki bā 'alamī nūri mu'jizāt
dar kullī dahr^e nist^e chun ū Qā'imī ba-dhāt.

In this poem the author apparently refers to the same heroic exploit of the three *fīdawīs*:

Wa'z qaṣḍi yak piyāda bar āmad zi sāqi 'arsh
dar sharq-u gharb^e na'ra wa āwāzi: "shāh^e māi"
W'aknūn ba sa'yi khūbi si khādīm ki yāf'tand
dar 'alamī jihād^e zi dīwāni Haqq barāt.

In several other *qaṣīdas* he mentions the name of Imam Muḥammad ibn Hasan, or Muḥammad ibn 'Alā dhikri-hi's-salām. Apparently his poem is quoted by the author of the *Raudatu's-ṣafā* in his account of the Ismailis (vol. IV, 80): '*yakī az shu'arāyi Ismā'iliyya dar sha'ni ū* (i.e. Muḥammad b. 'Alā dhikri-hi's-salām) *gūyad*:

gham-rā kujā wujūd bi-mānad chu mā barīm
nāmī Muḥammad Ibni 'Alā dhikri-hi's-salām,

which looks typical of Hasan from the point of view of the metre and the manner of expression. He is often politely called in different Ismaili works *Ra'is* Hasan, which most probably is an allusion to some official rank which he possessed. The quotation found in the *Ma'dīnu'l-asrār* (or *Faṣl dar bayāni shinākhti Imām*, edited by me in the *Ismailitica* I, cf. p. 19) and attributed to him,

¹ This person is also referred to in another poem by the same Hasan found in the same collection.

² So he is called in all early copies of all Ismaili works which are so far accessible, in which his name is referred to, although non-Ismaili authors usually style him 'Alā'u'd-dīn.

is really found in one of his poems in the same collection. The poem begins with:

*Khizid° tā dil az ghami dunyā judā kunīm
dar rāhi dīn mutabā'atī awliyā kunīm.*¹

The text of the poem which is offered here, with a translation, is fairly correct, and only in a few places some words cannot be properly read. In the text offered here as few alterations are introduced as possible, but its orthography is brought in agreement with the ordinary style.

TRANSLATION.

The Ode by Hasan in Praise of (Three) Fidawīs.

Praise, glory, and thousands of benedictions be upon the three heroes, the brave swordsmen, capturers of kings!

Upon those victorious warriors on the path of the religion, out of fear and fright for whom the world prays for mercy!

Faithfulness to their word, and intrepidity are the principles which they have manifested in this world.

Regard it that the breeze of their resolution brings to fruition in the garden of the realm of eternity the jasmine of victory.²

5 Recently three courageous youths have achieved what the foresighted (wise men) would regard with respect.

One of them was Husām, a native of Ābiz in Zirkūh³, who has reached the feast of happiness in the realm of Light.

The second, called Hasan, was by origin from the famous Negro servants (*mah Zangiyān*) of the shrine of Tūn⁴,—a man who was like a torch amongst the best men of religion.

The third, Mansūr, a native of Chāhak⁵, the matchless hero,—the falcon of his victory caught the soul of the enemy.

The mirror-like celestial spheres have tied a special sign of the light of victory on the turban of the world,—through the (act of) the hands and daggers of each three,

¹ The first *miṣrā'* of the quotation is read here as: *Salmān ki āfarīni Jahān-āfarīn bad-ū'st...* i.e. Salmān (Fārsi) through whom the Creator has created the world. On p. 16, top, there is another quotation from the same author, also from a *qaṣida* found in the same collection; many emendations may also be introduced.

² The *hernistich* is not quite legible, especially the word 'jasmine'.

³ Ābiz, or, as it is now called, Āviz, lies due East from Qā'in, about 45 miles in the direct line, at the foot of Kūhi Shāz.

⁴ Tūn, formerly an important local trading centre, lies NW from Qā'in in the desert, about 45 miles from Gunābād. It is not clear, what 'shrine' is here referred to,—at present there is no famous shrine there. Most probably it was an Ismaili shrine, which was destroyed later on, during the Mongol period.

⁵ Chāhak now is a small village in the desert North from Birjand, in about 35 miles. In the past it formed an important knot of caravan routes of local trade.

By the help and might of the Lord of the time, Muḥammad, 10
through whom the sky and the earth have come into existence.

Listen to me now, so that I may tell thee a story, explaining
the matter,—a story which is like princely pearls:

When Ildigiz, through his perversion and wickedness, had
chosen, at the bidding of his fate, the path of arrogance,

The Lord of the Eternal Kingdom gave an order to his wazir
and *dā'i* (to oppose) the actions of that malefactor.

And that centre of the world of good luck, the Polar star of the
kingdom of religion, the unique personality in history, Muḥaffar
ibn Muḥammad,

Sent three men from the committee (?) for the purpose; 15
and the affair came out very well.

They went, all three, and the axe of vengeance got its sheath;
and from the throat and breast of that unworthy rogue,

From his dirty soul, as if by the decree of God,—‘be, and it
was’, hell produced smoke and sparks by the flame of fire.

Out of the three horsemen who accompanied him two fled in
fear, one towards rocks, and the other hiding in a cave.

The third servant, who remained with him, tasted from the
cup of the sword the wine which gave him the drowsiness of death.

None of these warriors for the cause of the (sacred) Word re- 20
ceived any injury in this affair from the arms¹ of the enemy.

All three came back, with the help of the Qā'im, (bringing)
victory and happiness to all sides.

Evil tongue and evil eye of the bad, be away from the obedient
slaves! Theirs is the mighty Kingdom, which punishes its enemies!

Who was he in the world who dared to show impudence towards
this (High) authority and who has not lost his life?

These cursed enemies of God do not realize that their life
and authority is approaching its limit, that

Every one who thinks of opposing the Lord (*Qā'im*) of the 25
Universe, is punished by the fate by violent death.

The chosen prophets preached and warned people about this
from the beginning, that such is the promised punishment.

Whoever disbelieves a right prophecy, would really be worse than
the crowds of unbelievers.

Is not the sky high through what you three have done? Is
not the vile pretence broken—in the eyes of all the enemies?

I would like to have a thousand enlightened souls in me, so that
I might scatter them under your feet, for the sake of religion!

Brothers, when the blessed time arrives, and the good luck 30
of both worlds accompanies us,

The king, who possesses more than a hundred thousand cavalry,
would be frightened by a single warrior.

But it also is possible that when our good luck is on the wane,
our spring may turn autumn, and the autumn—spring.

¹ Here contemptuously *sikh*,—roasting-spit.

Did not to-day the sun of the Great Resurrection rise from behind the loftiness of the preaching of Mustanşir, and of the prayer of Nizār?¹

Is not it so that whoever has no respect for Him, indulging in these terrible acts of tyranny, he will on the Day of Judgment be rejected by God, helpless as if drowning in mud?

35 Why should not we fear Him, every moment laying our sinful cheeks in a prostration on the ground of prayer for forgiveness?

Why cannot we abide by truth and cleanliness, being happy by the benefit of this boundless blessing?

Is not it that through the excess of our disreputable actions we have lost from our heart and vision the direction of righteousness and dignity?

One of such people am I myself, whose sins, errors and faults are innumerable, as manifested in the sins that are done.

But, as I am a member of His following (*jamā'at*), I still hope that on the Day of the 'Settlement of the Accounts', He will not punish me for the consideration of this fact (i.e. of my being his follower).

40 May His all-comprising generosity bring in motion the sky of the world of forgiveness over my unfortunate head!

May the intercession of His Saints help me to pass by (the narrow bridge of) the *Şirāt* which hangs between Paradise and Hell!

O Ḥasan, when thy tale has reached this, start from the beginning, saying: 'praise, glory, and thousands of benedictions'!

قصیده حسن در مدح فدویان

درود محمّد و آفرین هزار هزار

بران یلان سلاطین ربای تیغ گذار

مجاهدان همایون لقا که میخواهد⁽²⁾

ز هول هیبت ایشان جهان بجان زینهار

وفای قول و ثبات قدم درین عالم

قواعدیست که اینان همی کنند اظهار

¹ These obviously are the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanşir bi'l-lāh and his son Nizār.

² میخواهند .

نسیم همت ایشان شمر که می آرد
 5 باغ ملک بقا یسمن (?) فتوح ببار
 بتازگی سه جوان دلاور آن کردند
 که اعتبار پذیرند ازان اولو الابصار
 یکی حسام ز آبیز زیر کوه که اوست
 رسیده سور سروری بعالم انوار
 دوم ز تخمه مه زنگیان بقعه تون
 ستوده بالحسن آن شمع زبده (?) ابرار
 سیم ز چاهکیان بی نظیر منصوری
 که باز نصرت او جان خصم کرد شکار
 ز دست خنجر هر یک سپهر آئنه گون
 ز نور فتح جهان را شعار بست دستار
 10 بعون قدرت صاحب زمان محمد آن
 که آسمان و زمین را باوست استظهار
 کنون تو گوش بمن دار تا کنم پیشست
 روایتی بسیانی چو لؤلؤ شہوار
 چو الدگر بنگونساری و شقاوت خویش
 گزیده بر ره فرمان طریق استکبار
 ملیک ملک ابد بر وزیر داعی خویش
 براند حکم که در یاب کار آن مکار

مدار عالم اقبال قطب دولت دین
مظفر ابن محمد یکانه ادوار

15

ز مرکز نجمن (?) هر سه را بامر امام
گسیل کرد باین کار و کار شد چو نگار

شدند هر سه و سکین کین بیافت نیام
ز حلق سینه آن نا سزای بد کردار

ز جان تیره او چون قضای کن فیکون
بتاب آتش دوزخ رساند دود شرار

هران سوار که در موکش بدند از بیم
گریختند یکی سوی که یکی سوی غار

یکی غلام که با او بمانده بود چشید
ز جام تیغ شرابی که مرک داشت نهار

20

نیافت هیچ یکی زان مجاهدان سخن
دران میانه بموی ز سیخ (?) خصم آزار

بیامدند بتأیید قائمی هر سه
فتوح سوی یمین و سعود سوی یسار

زبان چشم بدان دور باد خود باشد
ز بندگان مطیعان دولت قهار

که بود در همه عالم که پای گستانی
درین مقام نهاد و ز جان نگشت آوار

ز حال بی‌خبرند این معندان لعین
که عمر دولت ایشان همی رسد بکنار
25 خلاف قائم کلی هرانکه اندیشد
فلک برآورد از جان او بقر دمار
ازان که وعده چنین است انبیای گزین
باین مبشر منذر بدند از اول کار
هرانکه وعده راست خلاف پندارد
بتر بود بحقیقت ز زمره کفار
ایا بدست شما هر سه آسمان بلند
شکسته در بصر دشمنان دعوت خوار
هزار جان منور ببایدم تا من
باعتماد کنم پیش پای هر سه نثار
30 برادران چو رسید آن زمان فیروزی
که باشد از دو جهان بخت نیک با ما یار
بیک پیاده اندر مقام ترس افتد
شهی که باشدش افزون ز صد هزار سوار
روا بود که چنین در منازل تقصیر
بهار مان بخزان میرسد خزان بهار
نه آفتاب قیامت برآمدست امروز
ز کوه دعوت مستنصرو دعای نزار

نه هر که زو بنترسد دران مظالم هول
بکل ز داور روز جزا بود بيزار

35 چرا ازو بنترسيم و هر نفس ننهيم

رخ جرايم خود بر زمين استغفار
چرا بهالم صدق و صفا نني باشيم

ز فيض اين شرف لايزال برخوردار
مگر ز غايت اين کردهای نا محمود

شدست مان ز دل و دیده راه رشد وقار
يکی منم که ز کفر آنها که کردستم

گناه سهو خطای منست بس بسيار
چو در جماعت او ام اميد میدارم

که او بآن بنگيرد مرا بروز شمار
40 سخای شامل او بر سر من مسکين

سپهر عالم غفران در آورد بمدار
مرا شفاعت احباب او گذاره کند

بران صراط که باشد میان جنت و نار
42 حسن چو اين سخن اينجا رسيد با سر شو

درود محمدت و آفرين هزار هزار

تم

THE TIRAYARS IN MOHENJO DARO

By The Rev. H. HERAS, S.J.

It is well known that the Cōla kings of Tanjore are supposed to come from a race of people known as the Tirayars,¹ a name that means 'people of the sea' or 'of the waves'; for both meanings are attached to the word *tira*. They seem to have been a seafaring tribe of extraordinary daring and activity, for many of the ancient pre-Aryan tribes were seafaring people and yet they only deserved to be called 'people of the sea'.

Amongst the many ancient tribes mentioned in the inscriptions of the Indus Valley the Tirayars occupy a prominent place. A brief survey of the inscriptions that speak of them will be of interest to all Indian scholars.

Let the first be the following:

𐎧 𐎧 𐎧²

The first sign commencing from the left is repeated. It belongs to a large family of phonetic signs which all begin by *t*-. It is similar to this sign 𐎧, found in the Jemdet Nasr tablets of Sumer, only that the direction of the sign is changed and that the latter is as usual turned 90° to the left.³ In Jemdet Nasr it reads *bar* which means 'to open'.⁴ Now 'to open' in Dravidian languages is *tira*, which also means: 'wave' and 'sea'. This sign therefore reads *tira*. Now whenever a sign is repeated twice, it means plurality. Whatever is not one, two for instance, is already plural. Accordingly, the first way of forming the plural of a noun is to suffix the numeral *ir*, 'two', to it. This is very common in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions.⁵ Thus these two signs will read *tirair*, 'the Tirayars', as we call them at present.

The other sign stands for the suffix of the genitive, *adu*, 'of'.

This inscription, therefore, will read:

Tirair adu

which means: 'of the Tirayars'. Evidently the seal meant that the object sealed by it belonged to the tribe of the Tirayars.

¹ Kanakasabhai, *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, pp. 47-48.

² Photo, H. Neg. 3040, No. 13; H. Neg. 3054, No. 10.

³ Cf. Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization*, II, p. 454; Heras, *The Origin of the Sumerian Script*, *Journal of the University of Bombay*, VI, Pt. VII; Heras, *A Proto-Indian Sign from Vala*, *Q.J.M.S.*, XXVIII, pp. 141-143.

⁴ Langdon, *Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet Nasr*, No. 160.

⁵ Cf. Marshall, *op. cit.*, Nos. 204, 248, 338, etc.

Another inscription runs thus:

𐤔	𐤌	𐤁	𐤅	𐤔	𐤍	𐤁 ¹
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Sign No. 1. Stands for 'the waxing moon'. It is used even at present with such meaning. It will therefore read: *valarpire*.

Sign No. 2 is similar to this 𐤅 *tēr*, 'to reach', but one stroke is shortened. In order to obtain its phonetic value, we must, therefore, shorten the word *ter*. Our sign finally reads *ēr*, 'to rise'.

Sign No. 3 belongs to the phonetic family of 𐤔. Cf. Sign No. 3 of the preceding inscription. That reads *adu*, 'of'. This changes a little: *ēdu*, 'the year'.

Sign No. 4 is well-known *tira*, 'to open', 'the sea', 'the waves'.

Sign No. 5 is the substantive verb 'to be', *ir*.

Now signs Nos. 4 and 5 combine and read *tirair*, another way of forming the plural, 'the Tirayars'.

Sign No. 6 represents a being superior to man, for he has four arms, something beyond nature, *kaḍavul* 'god'. It is the generic name for god.

Sign No. 7 as explained is *adu*; but here probably is not the suffix of possession, but a demonstrative pronoun 'that', which reads the same.

Thus the whole inscription will read as follows:

Valarpire ēr ēdu tirair kaḍavul adu

which means: 'That (is) the god of the Tirayars in the year of the rising of the waxing moon'.

The second part of this translation seems to be a little too obscure. From the study of a number of similar epigraphs, it is evident that those people named the years after an event that happened during it. Even we do the same now: we say 'the year of the outbreak of the War', or 'the year of the Coronation', etc.² What was really the meaning of this denomination 'the year of the rising of the waxing moon' is difficult to say.

This inscription refers to the god of the Tirayars. Who was this god? He is mentioned in another short inscription.

𐤔 𐤌 𐤁³

in which all the signs are already known: it reads:

¹ Photo, M.D., 1930-31, No. 12342.

² Cf. Heras, *The Longest Mohenjo Daro Epigraph*, *Journal of Indian History*, XVI, pp. 236.

³ Photo, H. Neg. 3050, No. 29; H. Neg. 4162, No. 3.

Tira kaḍavuḷ aḍu

which means: 'That (is) the God of the sea'. Evidently the god of the Tirayars,—the people of the sea, great seafarers,—could not but be the god of the sea. But what was finally his name? The inscriptions do not give it. Yet the great god of the Phoenicians, who most likely are the Panis referred to in the *Rgveda*¹ was called *Aleyan*.² Now this is a purely Dravidian name, which means 'the one of the waves', for *ale* means 'waves'. Was therefore Aleyan the god worshipped by the Tirayars also?

Let us study another inscription:

𐤀	𐤁	𐤂	𐤃	𐤄	𐤅	𐤆	𐤇	𐤈 ³
9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Sign No. 1 is also found in Sumerian script. It means 'the country', 'the lands'. Therefore, *nila*.

Sign No. 2. The numeral 'one' or.

Sign No. 3 is found in Egyptian writing. It means 'to think' 'to calculate'. Hence in our Proto-Dravidian language it should be *en*.

Signs Nos. 2 and 3 combine and read *oruen*, 'the one who is one', i.e. 'God'.

Sign No. 4 is the pictograph of a 'fish', *mīn*.

Signs Nos. 5 and 6 already known and combining read *tirair*, 'the Tirayars'.

Sign No. 7 is a compound sign, its elements being *ψ* *vēl*, 'trident' and *𐤀* *ūr*, city. The sign, therefore will read *Vēlūr*.

Sign No. 8 represents the Supreme Being, *Āṇ*, 'the Lord'.

Sign No. 9 as sign No. 7. Therefore, the whole inscription will read as follows:

Nila oruen mīn tirair vēlūr Āṇ vēlūr

which means: 'Vēlūr of the Tirairs of the Fish of Him who is one of the lands (is) Vēlūr of the Lord'.

In this inscription the word *nila* is a qualificative of *Tirair*. The inscription therefore speaks of the Tirayars of the lands. Moreover, these Tirayars are said to be 'of the Fish of Him who is one', viz. devoted to the Fish of *Āṇ*, or one of the forms of *Āṇ*.⁴ The Tirayars are said to be the lords of Vēlūr in the inscription—*Tirair Vēlūr*. Now the present Vēlūr (Valore) is situated in the

¹ *Rg.*, I, 83, 4; V, 34, 5-7; VI, 53, 3; VII, 66, 10.

² Montgomery-Harris, *The Rās Shamra Mythological Texts*, pp. 33ff. (Philadelphia, 1935). That the Phoenicians are a Dravidian tribe is maintained by Autran, *Mithra, Zoroastre et la préhistoire aryenne du Christianisme*, pp. 68-71 (Paris, 1935).

³ Photo, M.D., 1928-9, No. 5616.

⁴ Cf. Heras, *The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to the Inscriptions*, *Journal of the University of Bombay*, V. Pt. I, pp. 7-9.

North Arcot District. This district and the District of Chingelput roughly are the ancient Tondamaṇḍalam which is supposed to be the original country of the Tirayars.¹

Finally, the inscription tells us that this Vēlūr which seems to be an important city, if not the capital of the Tirayars, was Vēlūr of Āṇ, i.e. the future Āṇḍavar or (Siva) Āṇḍivanan, in Tamil, or Tamburān, in Malayalam. The meaning of this sentence being that Āṇ himself was the ruler of Vēlūr, for as explained elsewhere these Proto-Indians had a theocratic government.²

Another inscription will tell us the internal social constitution of this tribe.

W	∞	≡	Ǝ	7 ³
5	4	3	2	1

Sign No. 1: *tira*, 'sea'.

Sign No. 2: *adu*, 'of'.

Sign No. 3. All the strokes represent walls, and therefore the spaces between stroke and stroke represent houses, therefore here 'five houses', i.e. *aivīḍ*.

Sign No. 4 represents the sign ∞ repeated twice and entwined with each other. This sign reads *ūr*, 'city', or 'country'. Here the two signs being united will mean 'united countries'. Since 'union' is represented in our script by the sign Ǝ which reads *kalak*, our sign here will read *kalakūr*.

Sign No. 5 represents a vessel containing some liquid at a very low level. It means 'low'. Therefore it will read *kīl*, which also means 'east'.

Hence the reading of the whole inscription will be as follows:—

Tira adu aivīḍ kalakūr kīl

which means: 'The five houses of the sea (are) at the east of the United Countries'.

Now we have seen that the Tirayars are the people of the sea, but this inscription seems to inform us that there are five houses of the sea, viz. of people of the sea. The word *vīḍ* may also be used in the sense of 'family'. Therefore the inscription evidently discloses that there were five sections or classes of Tirayars. This information is quite in agreement with the information found in the *Tondaimaṇḍalapadyam*. As late as the 16th century A.D. families of Tirayars who were living in the Chingelput and North Arcot Districts were divided into the five following clans:

Pangala Tirayar = Tirayars of Bengal,
China Tirayar = Tirayars of China,

¹ Cf. Kanakasabhai, *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, p. 48.

² Cf. Heras, *The Religion*, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

³ Photo, H. Neg. 3856, No. 1.

Kadara Tirayar = Tirayars of Burma,
Singala Tirayar = Tirayars of Ceylon,
Pallava Tirayar = Tirayars of the Pallavas.¹

Evidently these five clans of Tirayars existed from a very long time, though their denominations may have varied. These denominations show the countries with which they had been trading.

Now the inscription finally informs us that these five clans of Tirayars are to the east of the United Countries. It is difficult to say what were these united countries for there were several unions of this kind.² Since there was a sort of connection between the Tirayars and the Kalakilas, as we shall see presently, we may perhaps venture to state that the united countries referred to are the countries of the Kavals and of the Kalakilas. The inscription that contains a foundation for such a statement is the following:

𑀓	𑀔	𑀕	𑀖	𑀗 ³
5	4	3	2	1

Sign No. 1: *tira*, 'sea'.

Sign No. 2: *or*, 'one'.

Signs No. 1 and 2 combine: *tiraor*, 'the Tirayars' (another form of the plural).⁴

Sign No. 3 is the same as sign No. 5 of the preceding inscription. Here the liquid is marked by the vertical strokes: *kīl*, 'below', 'under'.

Sign No. 4 are two united leaves, as explained elsewhere.⁵ Therefore it reads Kalakila, 'united leaves', the name of a tribe.

Sign No. 5 originally is a 'scale', *tūk*. When it has this little sign 𑀘 above, it reads *tūkoḍu*, with the scale. Persons said to be with the scale may mean that they are merchants.

The following will be the reading of this inscription :

Tiraor kīl kalakila tūkoḍu.

This inscription may have two different translations:

1st translation: 'The merchant Kalakilas (are) under the Tirayars'.

2nd translation: 'The Kalakilas (are) under the Tirayars with the Scale (in the month of the Scale).'

From the inscription it is evident that the Tirayars exercised some authority over at least a group of Kalakilas. Whether these

¹ Kanakasabhai, *op. et loc. cit.*

² Cf. Heras, *Mohenjo Daro, the People and the Land, Indian Culture*, III, pp. 707-719.

³ Photo, H. Neg. 3876, No. 2.

⁴ Cf. Heras, *Karnāṭaka and Mohenjo Daro, The Karnataka Historical Review*, IV, pp. 4-5.

⁵ Cf. Heras, *Two Proto-Indian Inscriptions from Chanhū Daro, J.B.O.R.S., XXII*, pp. 311-312.

were all the Kalakilas or only those who were engaged in trade is a matter of speculation. Yet, it would after all be strange if only the Kalakila traders were subject to the Tirayars. This makes me suspect that the second translation is the more probable of the two. In that case this epigraph would record the fact that the Kalakilas had become the subjects of the Tirayars in the month of the Scale.

A final inscription refers to the chief or head of the Tirayar tribe, who is not called a king or a ruler, but only a leader. The inscription runs thus:

𑀧	𑀢	𑀥	𑀭	𑀮	𑀲 ¹
6	5	4	3	2	1

Sign No. 1 is the Sign 𑀲 *ūr*, 'country' with the determinative of the locative *ū*, 'in'. Therefore, it will read *ūril*, in the country.

Sign No. 2 is the participle of the substantive verb *ir*. It reads *ire*, 'being', or 'who is'.

Sign No. 3 stands for number 'seven', *ēl*.

Signs Nos. 4 and 5 are well known.

Sign No. 6, as explained elsewhere² reads *uḍayan*, 'the leader'. The inscription, therefore, will read as follows:

ūril ire ēl tira adu uḍayan

which means: 'The leader of the seven seas who is in the country'. The clause *ūril ire* seems to be synonymous to this 'who is living' or 'the present one'. Accordingly this would be the seal of the living leader of the Tirayars. His peculiar title seems to be 'the leader of the seven seas', a title which is in perfect agreement with the occupation of the tribe. The *purāṇas* which, though finally composed at a much later period, describe the whole of the world as being formed by seven *dvīpas* or great insular continents. These seven *dvīpas* are surrounded by seven great seas,³ which seem to be the seven seas mentioned in the inscription under study. Thus, to call the chief of the Tirayars 'the leader of the seven seas' is the same as to call him 'the lord of the whole Ocean'.

One thing is evident from all these inscriptions that the Tirayars were a very influential tribe in the Proto-historic period of India. They were very likely enriched by the trade they maintained with foreign lands across the sea on the eastern coast, just as the Minas and probably the Paṇis⁴ were the traders of the western seas.

¹ Photo, M. D., 449 of 1930-31, No. 11212.

² Cf. Heras, *Chanhu Daro and its Inscriptions*, St. Xavier's College Magazine, XXIX, pp. 102-108.

³ For instance, cf. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, II, 2.

⁴ Cf. Heras, *The Origin of the Round Proto-Indian Seals Discovered in Sumer*, B.B. & C.I. Annual, 1938.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Nizamu'l-Mulk Asaf Jah I (Founder of the Hyderabad State). By DR. YUSUF HUSAIN KHAN, D.Litt. (Paris), Reader in History, Osmania University, Hyderabad. D.B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay, 1936. Pp. vi+316. Rs.6.

Admittedly it is a difficult task to write clearly about the later Moghul Period—as indeed it is about any period of political confusion, where no single person or motive unifies events. It requires a nice sense of discrimination to choose the relevant from the irrelevant, the necessary from the unnecessary facts and events. Dr. Khan's book would have been more intelligible, if he had not confused the reader with a plethora of details and names. A sixth of the book for instance deals with the ancestry of Nizamu'l-Mulk, which could easily and profitably have been summarized in a page or two. Similarly the conflict between Sambhaji and Sahu or between the different Maratha leaders in Gujrat are really unnecessary for the history of Nizamu'l-Mulk: A mere statement of results would have been quite sufficient.

It is a queer paradox that Nizamu'l-Mulk's achievement lives because he had not the genius for greater things! He founded the Hyderabad State because he was incapable of effectively directing the Imperial Government. He was brought up in the traditions of Aurangzeb, and received his training in the Emperor's Deccan Wars, where his capacity and his father's influence won him the usual promotions and even Aurangzeb's confidence. But the period of confusion, intrigue, disorder, and debauchery, that followed Aurangzeb's death saw the eclipse of Nizamu'l-Mulk. He was no Bairam Khan or Balban who could impose his will upon jealous nobles or an incapable emperor. He would have been a great servant of a great master, but at no time do we find him dominating or controlling persons or events. In fact he made no effort to establish his power in Delhi; rather he fled from the oppositions and intrigues of the Imperial Court and sought refuge in the Deccan. That country and its resources he knew well, and had spent his youth in bringing it under Moghul suzerainty. He defeated the Imperial armies sent to oust him, and as a reward received the Imperial Firman confirming him viceroy of the six Subas, and so in 1724 Nizamu'l-Mulk laid the foundation of the de facto sovereign State of Hyderabad. It is a plain tale of a good man and a capable man, but by no means a remarkable man. It is a pity, therefore, the author has fallen a victim to the temptation to glorify his theme. 'His genius', says the author, 'shone forth in action. His love of power was supported by a splendid fearlessness, tempered with prudence. . . . In fact he was gifted

with a pronounced political genius and with an astounding power of foresight. Throughout his life Nizamu'l-Mulk showed himself to be a born ruler of men, a great soldier, a capable administrator. . . . But claims and achievements are here as so often at variance! In each of the three major crises that he was called upon to face his leadership led to disaster. By the Convention of Mungi-Shevgaon he was forced to cede the right of Chauth and Sardeshmukhi in the six subas of the Deccan, and to reinstate the Maratha revenue collectors whom he had turned out (p. 189). Called upon to frustrate the Maratha designs in the North, his military failures forced upon him an ignominious treaty (p. 215). Against Nadir Shah his leadership was uninspiring and nerveless. Nor, during his two periods of Vizierate, did he show himself equal to the task of reorganizing the state and its administration. And unfortunately we are not told how his schemes of administrative reforms in the Deccan progressed after the defeat by the Marathas nor is there any reference to the conduct of Hyderabad affairs during the last ten years of Nizamu'l-Mulk's life (1738-48).

The book also suffers from a cumbersome style and, often, bad English. Nizamu'l-Mulk's ancestry is referred to in the index as his 'pedigree', and such phrases as 'to give a surprise to the enemy', 'he was told off to protect', 'At last the expected event soon happened' occur again and again. With a little more care these could surely have been avoided.

AZEEM TYABJI.

The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran. By E. S. DROWER ('E. S. STEVENS'). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937. Pp. xxvi+436, with 29 plates. Royal 8vo.

After a long period of stagnation, things in the East are at present in the process of very rapid change. We need not here enter the question as to whether these changes are to the good or to the bad; what matters is that things change, and that much of what heretofore formed part of the ordinary life, was a link with remote antiquity, is at present being rapidly discarded and forgotten. Small religious communities who with almost superhuman tenacity preserved their beliefs and mentality for long centuries, ancient customs, tales, isolated dialects, etc., all these die with astounding rapidity. For the student of Eastern civilizations this material would undoubtedly be incomparably more important and precious than merely books, or archæological monuments connected with the remote past. And yet while archæological excavations command general interest, and attract many students, so little is done at present to record all that still remains available for first-hand study of what may be called 'archæology of life'. It is far

easy, indeed, to write a lengthy essay,—as is often done,—on the 'influence of something upon something in the Vedic (or pre-Vedic) period', etc., while quietly sitting in one's own study, in complete comfort. And it is quite a different thing to do 'field research' work, by coming in contact with often rude, dirty, ignorant, and unreliable people, enduring hardships and privations, and overcoming a large number of difficulties.

The book under review belongs exactly to this latter class, and is a result of long patient studies of the ancient religion of the Mandaeans. Members of this community are found settled in small groups in Mesopotamia and a few spots in Persia, and it is a sad fact that their already very depleted number becomes smaller every year. Their religion forms one of the most enigmatic phenomena of the religious life of the Near and Middle East. It seems as if the basis of it is of early Iranian origin, but this nucleus is very much overlaid with substantial borrowings from the ancient Babylonian, Christian and Jewish systems. The author took great pains to record first-hand information about the sect, by observing their rites, customs, their mentality and religious attitude. This makes the book extremely valuable, although, perhaps, more intended for specialists rather than to general reader. It offers all that may refer to the ceremonies, ritual dress, etc., and a good deal of specimens of the folklore of the sect. All this is very valuable not only because things of this kind cannot be properly observed by a casual student, or a tourist,—they require a sort of 'specialization',—but also because much of what still is in general use may very soon be forgotten and lost forever. The technicalities of the different ceremonies, etc., are often very valuable 'fossils' of the earliest strata of the evolution of the sect. And yet they almost always are preserved only by oral tradition, and only very rarely described in sacred books. If neglected and discontinued, they disappear forever, leaving no trace.

The book is excellently printed, and is supplied with a considerable number of very good photographs, which help much to understand the text. But at the same time it is by no means free from defects, of which a rather unsystematic way of transliteration is not the least. And it seems that while giving the most interesting details of the outer side of the religion, the author did not pay as much attention to its philosophical and moral doctrine. But this may easily be supplemented from earlier publications giving texts and translations of the religious books of the sect.

By the way, the author repeats the mistake which can often be seen in many works,—the terms 'Parsi' and 'Parsism' are applied to what really should be called 'Zoroastrian' and 'Zoroastrianism'. It is true that the Parsis of India form the majority of the followers of Zoroaster at present. But Persian members of the community never call themselves 'Parsi',—this is an Indian caste name, and is subordinate to the wider term 'Zoroastrian'.

W. I.

The Types of Sanskrit Drama. By D. R. MANKAD, D. J. Sind College, Karachi. Published by Urmi Prakashan Mandir, Denso Hall, Karachi. 1936. Pp. xi+211.

This book with a foreword by Dr. S. K. De takes the study of the Sanskrit dramatic theory a step forward in that it deals with Sanskrit Dramaturgy and Histrionic Art—subjects which are not yet fully explored. The book contains eight chapters, in which the author attempts to ascertain the nature of the types of Sanskrit Drama in their origin and development and two Appendices giving a list of plays quoted in dramaturgical texts and an alphabetical list of technical terms. The author's ambition, as Dr. De points out in the foreword, is not so much to give an exhaustive account or to make a comparative study but rather to examine critically the Sanskrit dramatic theory by an intensive study of the dramaturgic as well as dramatic texts. The author has admirably succeeded in his modest object and has avoided as far as possible unwarranted and sweeping generalizations. In the introductory chapter he has very ably discussed the question of the inter-relation of the three important phases, in the evolution of the Sanskrit dramatic theory represented by the terms *Nṛtta*, *Nṛtya* and *Nāṭya*. The documentary evidence brought to bear on this topic is remarkably decisive, as far as it can be in the present state of our knowledge and goes a long way to support his conclusion that from the point of view of evolution first comes *Nṛtta*, then *Nṛtya* and last *Nāṭya*. *Nṛtta* is mere dance, *Nṛtya* has gesture indicating a particular *Bhāva* added to it, while *Nāṭya* has speech (i.e. dialogue) in addition to these evoking *Rasa* in the audience. His inference that the form of entertainment based on *Nṛtya* must have been called *Uparūpaka* and the one based on *Nāṭya* must have been designated as *Rūpaka*, is very plausible. The view that *Nāṭya* as a term for drama is comparatively older than *Rūpaka* seems to be based on reliable documentary evidence with the result that *Rūpaka* denotes a stage of drama more advanced than that represented by *Nāṭya* in so far as the former includes the whole of the *Nāṭya* process and adds to it the element of giving visibility to a particular role of an actor by dress and such other devices. In the chapters III–VII, the author discusses ten Species of *Rūpaka* with their four derivative types and twenty-two *Uparūpakas*, giving an exhaustive table showing various *Nṛtya* types with a complete mastery of details. It seems from the evidence adduced by the author that one-act dramas of the type of *Bhāṇa*, *Vithi*, *Aṅka*, *Prahasana* and *Vyāyoga* are the most primitive types of dramatic forms from which other complicated types like *Nāṭaka* and *Prakarana* must have evolved. Among the more complicated types a *Prakarana* preserves the coarser and more popular side of life as represented in *Bhāṇa* and *Prahasana* whereas the *Nāṭaka*, in the opinion of the author, was the literary drama *par excellence*. In discussing the evolution of *Nṛtya*-types in the VIIth chapter he is led to believe that

in very primitive stage *Bhāṇa* had two distinct aspects—one the terrible or boisterous represented by *Bhāṇa* itself and the other the gentle represented by *Bhāṇikā* and that on these two types all the other Uparūpakas seem to be based. The same theory holds good, according to the author, in the case of Rūpakas which are likely to have evolved from the *Bhāṇa-Rūpaka*. *Bhāṇa* in turn, either as a basis for *Nṛtya*-types or as a basis for *Rūpaka*-types, is to be further traced back to *Nṛtta* divided into *Uddhata* and *Masṛṇa*-types, the first being called *Tāṇḍava* and the other *Lāsya*. It is thus that he would trace all our dramatic, semi-dramatic and musical forms to *Tāṇḍava* and *Lāsya* forms. No doubt the tradition is entirely in favour of this theory and one may even say that it is likely to be corroborated by later researches, but at this stage the very charm and strikingness of it make us sceptic about its acceptance. Further one may not entirely agree with the author when he says that the *Nāṭya* form was undoubtedly secular in its origin; for he himself admits that *Nṛtya*-types seem to be religious and that the earliest *Nṛtta* forms, from which *Nāṭya* has evolved, may have been both religious and secular as the tradition connects them ultimately with the *Tāṇḍava* and the *Lāsya* of Śiva and Pārvatī respectively. Besides there is hardly any branch of literature which does not owe its origin and growth to the intelligent and shrewd priest class of Ancient India. Finally the author has proposed four stages in the gradual evolution of Sanskrit Dramatic Art as follows:—

- (1) *Nāṭya*-type with one actor and one act,
- (2) *Nāṭya*-type with one act and many actors,
- (3) Less complicated types of *Nāṭya* with many acts
and
- (4) The full-fledged *Nāṭya* and *Prakarana* types.

This division of four distinct periods proposed by the author will not be seriously questioned as it is a matter still practically open to conjecture. Moreover the division is not rigid enough as not to undergo any process of permutation and combination in case later researches necessitate such an adjustment.

The author has evidently shown a thorough grasp of his subject and any further researches in this line by such a keen student of Sanskrit Dramaturgy is eagerly awaited.

V. A. GADGIL.

Brahmavidyā: vol. I, pt. 1 (17th February 1937); the Adyar Library Bulletin. Published by C. SUBBARAYUDU, Adyar, Madras.

This is a new quarterly journal started under the auspices of the Theosophical Society, Adyar. It is devoted to the advancement of the Sanskritic studies; it proposes to publish old Sanskrit texts with commentaries and English translation. It will also contain

description of rare manuscripts in the Adyar Library and reviews of books, etc.

The first number starts with the publication of (1) *Ṛgveda-vyākhyā* of Mādhava (Māṇḍala, I. 1-10), (2) the translation of the *Yoga Upaniṣads* (*Advayatāraka*, *Amṛtanāda*, *Amṛtabindu* and a portion of the *Kṣurikā*) and (3) the *Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra* with the *Bhāṣya* of Devasvāmin (pp. 1-8). The first and the third are edited by Prof. C. K. Raja, M.A., D.Litt. (Oxon). Besides these, it contains two notes at the beginning, one by Prof. F. O. Schrader of Kiel 'on the name Kalkin' and another, which is a sort of brief critique of the Mysore edition of Dinnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, by Mr. N. A. Sastri. At the end, three important Mss. from the Adyar library, namely *Vāraruca-nirukta-samuccaya*, *Nṛsiṃhacampū* of Daivajña Sūrya Paṇḍita and *Nṛsiṃhavijñāpana* of Śrī Nṛsiṃhāśramin, are described; the first by Prof. C. K. Raja and the last two by Dr. V. Raghavan.

H. D. V.

Śrī Haima-līṅgānuśāsana of Kalikāla-sarvajña Hemacandra, with brief explanation in Sanskrit by Kesaravijaya; Edited by Upādhyāya Kṣamāvijaya Gaṇi and published by Vaidyaraṇ V. Mohanlal of Surat, Surat, 1937. Price not given.

This is a handy edition, nicely printed and got up, of Hemacandra's *Līṅgānuśāsana*. It contains 139 stanzas in different metres and is accompanied by brief Sanskrit notes prepared by Kesaravijaya in A.D. 1852. The book aims at teaching the gender of the various Sanskrit words, which are arranged in 7 groups. It is well edited by Pandit Kṣamāvijaya Gaṇi, who has also recently edited *Haimaparakāśa Vyākaraṇa* of Vinayavijaya.

H. D. V.

Tatvabindu of Vacaspati, with *Tatvavibhāvanā* by Rṣiputra Paramesvara, both edited by Mīmāṃsāratna V. M. Ramasastri, M.A., with an introduction in English and indexes and appendices, etc.; Annamalai University Series: No. 3. Annamalaiagar, 1936. Price Rupees three.

Tatvabindu is an important treatise on the source of Verbal cognition from the standpoint of the Mīmāṃsakas, composed by Vācaspati Miśra, who was himself a great Mīmāṃsaka, besides being very well versed in the other Śāstras, and who lived about the middle of the 9th century A.D. The commentary called *Tatvavibhāvanā* on it was composed by Rṣiputra Paramesvara II, who probably lived towards the middle of the 15th century A.D. The present edition of the *Tatvabindu* is based on a transcript of a manuscript of the *Tatvavibhāvanā* in the Madras Govt. Mss.

Library, (the *Tatvavibhāvanā* quotes as a rule, its text in full) and on the Benares edition of the *Tatvabindu*.

In his scholarly introduction, the editor gives a comprehensive and able survey of nearly 70 writers on the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā*, many of whom are merely known by their names up to now. Besides in the Appendix I, he gives an alphabetical table of minor authors and their works, whose dates fall between 1600 and 1850. His full analysis in English of the contents of the *Tatvabindu*, given in the second part of the introduction, will be of great help to the students of the *Tatvabindu*, since this is a very difficult book. The various indexes and appendices are bound to be extremely useful.

H. D. V.

Srī Praśastisaṃgraha: edited by AMETLAL MAGANLAL SHAH, Ahmedabad, 1937 (Sāṃvat, 1993). Price Rs. 5.

This is a collection of about 1450 Praśastis extracted from the Mss. of the different works of Jain literature. The term Praśasti is generally understood in the sense of 'the information given at the end of his work by an author about himself and his preceptors and also about the date, etc. of the work itself'. It is, however, sometimes extended to the account given by the scribes of Mss., regarding the date of the Ms. and some personal history of themselves. The present volume mostly contains Paraśastis of this latter type. These were culled out from the manuscripts, which were exhibited at the general exhibition of the Jain literature held in 1931 at Ahmedabad, under the auspices of the Deśavirati Dharmārādhaka Samāja. They are divided into two parts; the first contains 163 Praśastis from the palm-leaf Mss., while the second contains 1276 Praśastis from the paper Mss. At the end of the first part, a small artificial poem in 5 chapters, called Ānanda Lekha and composed in Sāṃ. 1694 by Vinayavijaya, pupil of Kirtivijaya of the Tapā Gaccha is given. Each part is separately paged and indexes of proper names occurring in the Praśastis are given at the end of each.

H. D. V.

India: A Short Cultural history. By H. G. RAWLINSON, C.I.E. Edited by Prof. C. G. Seligman, F.R.S., the Crescent Press. Pp. xvi+452. Price Rs.30.

The theme of this book is the political and cultural history of India from pre-historic to modern times. To survey so vast a subject within the space of about 400 pages is a very difficult task indeed, and the author himself is not unaware of the fact. The principal difficulty is, as he notes, as to what to select and what to reject: and compression of material necessitated by limitations of space may sometimes result in a distorted picture. On the whole, however, Mr. Rawlinson has emerged from his task creditably. He

writes with sympathy, and even with enthusiasm, though one sometimes feels that in elucidating the form, he has missed the spirit which lies underneath. His account is balanced, refreshingly free from bias; the theory of Greek influence on Sanskrit drama, for instance, has not been trotted out, and the myth of the Italian architect of the Taj is frankly rejected. The political history of India is, with considerable success, related to its cultural history, but the exploits of individual kings and soldiers seem to have received attention somewhat disproportionate to the scheme of a professed cultural history of India. Obviously, also, Mr. Rawlinson is not familiar with parts of the subject; this alone can explain, for instance, his characterization of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Hari Narayan Apte, and Narmadashankar, as imitators of Scott. On the whole, however, the work presents a very readable, sympathetic, and faithful account of the long and devious course of India's culture, excellently produced and enriched with twenty-three plates and forty-five smaller illustrations.

M.

1. Historical Selection from Baroda State Records, Vols. II (Pp. 151-285) and III (Pp. 287-464). Baroda State Press. Annas 15 and Rs.1-3.
2. Persian Sources of Indian History, Vol. II. Ed. G. H. Khare, Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal. Pp. vi+98. Rs.1-8.
3. Śivakāleen Patra Sāra-Saṅgraha, Vol. III. Ed. S. N. Joshi. Bharat Itihasa Samshodhak Mandal, Pp. viii+236. Rs.2-8.

These books testify to the unabated interest and activity in Maratha historical research. The two volumes of Baroda State records include several papers of value, mostly from the state archives, and cover a period roughly of three decades, 1769 to 1798. The period was one of considerable stress for the Gaikwad family, and its complete history is not yet possible to discern. The documents here collected throw light on many significant facts, e.g. that the Gaikwads maintained a navy which was capable of repulsing the Portuguese, and correct some errors, for instance, as to the date of Manajirao's death. They bear witness also to the ravages of a medieval famine in Gujerat and to Kanhojirao's administrative ability. An English résumé of each paper is appended, and this together with the indices makes for convenience of reference. The *Persian Sources of Indian History* comprises papers in Persian throwing light on several phases of Maratha history but mainly on the period of their rise to political eminence. The papers are accompanied by a Marathi translation, and a brief résumé in English; and the volume should prove useful to those interested in Maratha history. The last named work is a digest of papers relating to

Shivaji's times. The utility of such a digest can hardly be exaggerated, but the editor, in summarizing the contents of the different papers, has brought out only their political significance. But social, religious and cultural facts are as relevant to the historian's purpose as political events; and the work would doubtless have been more useful if this fact had been recognized.

The Vaishnavas of Gujerat. By N. A. THOOTHY, B.A., D.Phil. Longmans, 1935. Pp. xvi+489. Rs.15.

This work, which comprises substantially the thesis which was accepted for the degree of D.Phil. at the Oxford University in 1924, represents a competent endeavour to apply and test the Geddesian theory and method of interpretation of social phenomena. Its subject matter is also of peculiar interest and importance; the Vaishnavas of Gujerat, as the author observes, are 'a typical example of communities having thoroughly adapted themselves to a definite mode of life, and being then called upon, or forced, to readjust radically their habits and ideas to meet new conditions and circumstances arising from contact with strange peoples and strange civilizations and cultures'. This cultural invasion the Vaishnavas, like the other communities, resisted for long, doggedly trying to persevere in their ancient ways of life and thought; but that resistance is getting feebler every day. Dr. Thoothy's survey of their habitat, religious organization, their conceptions and habits of life, social organization, and their literature and art, forms an interesting and valuable record.

Hindu Mysticism according to the Upaniṣads. By MAHENDRA-NATH SIRCAR, Professor of Philosophy, Presidency College, Calcutta. Published by Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd. 1934.

This book like three other books of the same author dealing with Indian Philosophy, is a valuable contribution to the study of Mysticism in general and to Hindu Mysticism in particular. It mostly contains articles published by the author in different Oriental journals and presents in twenty-six chapters neither the growth nor the history of Mystic thought in India but rather different aspects of Hindu Mysticism as they are represented in the Upaniṣads. The author does not make any startling innovations which may give rise to controversy but tries to interpret the Upaniṣadic view faithfully and correctly with an unbiassed mind. He rightly points out in the Introduction that Truth cannot be won by intellect and that the Upaniṣads do not give any logical system but are full of intuitions and revelations. Mysticism is defined as the direct awareness of reality conceived as Truth and Mystical consciousness is the method of apprehending this Truth. The end of Hindu Mysticism is not, therefore, different from that

of Philosophy. The first dawn of Mystic life begins with the sublimation of nature and its culmination is marked by an intuitive approach to Truth, the Absolute. Intuition in the Upaniṣads is no process in time but has the sense of transcendent existence. It is superior to revelation because the latter is a process whereas the former is not. The Upaniṣads have, indeed, recorded the successive stages of knowledge as instruction, ratiocination, contemplation and intuition. The final stage of intuition is attained when a Mystic passes from the positive qualification of the Ātman as all-knowing and all-seeing to complete transcendence, the height of existence indicated by Silence. Before this stage is reached the Upaniṣads lay down two Paths for a Mystic during the period of training and transition:—(1) The path of direct realization of Truth; (2) The path of indirect realization. These two paths correspond really to two attitudes, the transcendent advocated by Śaṅkara and the theological adopted by Rāmānuja. The former is akin to a line of philosophic and transcendent intuition to be preceded by critical analysis, reflection and meditation and forms part of *Parā-Vidyā* while the latter is a line of synthetic intuition to be preceded by the method of psychic penetration and contemplation and falls within the region of *Aparā-Vidyā*. In the sphere of *Parā-Vidyā* direct knowledge leading to final deliverance from the bondage of the World plays an important part and on the other hand in *Aparā-Vidyā* UPĀSANĀ by progressive assimilation of life and delight places the Mystic in tune with the cosmic life. The Upaniṣads prescribe various forms of UPĀSANĀ for the complete melting of our former being and the re-moulding of it in divine harmony. It is noteworthy that in the life of a Hindu Mystic UPĀSANĀ stands mid-way between activism and transcendence. Closely related to these two attitudes is a question of ways of Exit from the World. Two paths of spiritual evolution, viz. the path of the Gods and the path of the Pitṛs, are prescribed in the Chāndogyaopaniṣad for a Hindu Mystic at the time of departure from the World. The choice between the two paths is governed by a particular attitude he takes up in life here. The souls trained in *Karma* follow the path of the Pitṛs while those disciplined in the various UPĀSANĀS pursue the path of the Gods. The *Jīvan-mukta* who, on the other hand, has realized what transcendence is and is not active in the usual sense but merely exhausts his residual *Karma*, attains salvation immediately after death.

This is, in short, a very brief outline of the life of a Hindu Mystic drawn from the twenty-six chapters that the author has devoted to the subject of Hindu Mysticism. The method of presenting the subject-matter in the form of writings contributed to different journals and brought together in this volume has necessarily involved a lot of overlapping and repetition. For instance, the matter treated in chapters XII, XIV and XX could have been brought under one chapter; similarly the chapters XV and XXV should constitute one and the same topic. Apart from this defect

the volume, on the whole, makes a very interesting and enlightened reading for all those interested in Philosophy in general and Mysticism in particular. Especially it renders a distinct service to Indian Culture in so far as it serves to bring vividly before Western minds the wisdom of the Hindus as revealed in the inspired utterances of the Upaniṣadic Seers. The author has pointed out correctly, indeed, that 'Truth is more than value. Values have no place in the transcendent reality. They are personal, Truth is impersonal. Truth is Absolute'. Again in the Chapter XI it is rightly suggested by the author that conflict between the sensible and the super-sensible seems to be permanent in the Platonic Mysticism. So it is in Christian Mysticism. The Upaniṣadic Mysticism, on the other hand, does not accept the division of existence into the sensible and the super-sensible. The sensible is the shadow, not the reality. Nay, the sensible finally resolves into the super-sensible when the Mystic sense dawns upon us.'

V. A. GADGIL.

Suvarṇabhāṣottama-Sūtra, das Gold-glanz Sūtra, ein Sanskrit Text des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus, nach den Handschriften und mit Hilfe der Tibetischen und Chinesischen Übertragungen, herausgegeben von Johannes Nobel, Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1937.

This is a splendid critical edition, prepared by Professor Johannes Nobel and published by Otto Harrassowitz, of a popular Mahāyāna Buddhist Text considered to be one of the nine Dharmas of the Nepalese Buddhists. It is based on six paper manuscripts (ABCDEF) and one palm-leaf manuscript (G), all written in Nepalese script, and some Tibetan and Chinese translations of the Sūtra. The manuscripts of the text teem with variant readings and—what is worse—all the available translations of the Text seem to be replete with several unwarranted additions, of paragraphs and even chapters, to the original Text. In the Comparative table at the end of the book, Prof. Nobel has shown how the Sanskrit Text, as preserved in the palm-leaf manuscript (G), consisting of eighteen (or nineteen) chapters has swollen in the Chinese version of I-tsing (late in the seventh or early eighth century A.D.) to as many as thirty-one chapters. Prof. Nobel suggests that the comparative study of the Tibetan and Chinese translations shows that the Chinese translation of Dharmakṣema (Dharmarakṣa, according to Hokei Idzumi) and one Tibetan translation which he styles Tib. I, come closer to the Sanskrit Text as preserved in the palm-leaf manuscript (G).

The earliest Chinese translation of the book was made by Dharmakṣema, who went to China in 414 A.D. and was assassinated in 433 A.D. The second Chinese translation was made by Paramārtha, who went to China in 548 A.D. and died there in 569 A.D. The third was done by Yaśogupta, with whom

Jñānagupta (who died, in 605 A.D., at the age of 77) collaborated. There was later a synthetic edition undertaken by Pao-kuei (597 A.D.), who put together all the earlier editions and added some new chapters. A fuller translation still was completed by I-tsing, who travelled in India during 671-695 A.D. and died in China on his return to his country, in 713 A.D., at the age of 79. Though I-tsing did not pay much attention to the corrupt and unintelligible readings in the text before him, this much is certain that he must be credited with having made the text more widely known. For, on his translation are based several translations in other languages. It has been already said that many additions were made in I-tsing's version.

There are three Tibetan translations, and even a fourth one of only a part. The oldest translation styled Tib. I was, according to Tibetan tradition, undertaken in the reign of a Tibetan King who ruled from 705 to 755 A.D. This is considered to be a very reliable text and approaches the Sanskrit text as preserved in the palm-leaf manuscript. This is very valuable in controlling the doubtful readings of the Sanskrit text. The second version, Tib. II, obtained directly from Sanskrit, was completed in the reign of King Ral-pa-can (804-816 A.D.), by Jinamitra, Silendrabodhi and Ye-Ses-de. This second edition differs from the first only in this respect that it is an enlarged and carefully revised edition, containing new passages inserted in the first edition. The third and the fourth translations are derived from I-tsing's Chinese translation. The Tibetan tradition was a living one and its soundness is proved by the agreement between the two Tibetan translations and the palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscript.

The popularity of this Text of the Buddhists is further proved by translations in other languages. An Uigur translation of I-tsing's version is published in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*. Some fragments of the same were discovered in the finds of the Third German Turfan Expedition. It was first taken cognizance of and partly published by F. W. K. Müller. This translation is based on I-tsing's version, not directly, says Prof. Nobel, but through Tib. III or IV. Fragments of Soghdish, West-Mongolian languages have been discovered. There are also translations in Mongolian, Manchurian and Japanese languages. One in Khotan-Sakish speech is interesting from the linguistic point of view as well as from the point of the historic study of the Text.

That this Sūtra, known as *Konkōmōkyō* in Japan, was long respected in that country is proved by the fact that Prince Shotoku built the temple Shitennoji. The Temple of the Four Guardian-Gods, now called Tennoji, in Osaka, about 585-587 A.D., for a victory that he obtained over his enemy. Now this name seems to have been derived from the sixth chapter of the book, *Suvarṇabhāsottama*. The Four Guardian-Gods in that chapter guarantee that wherever the Sūtra is (read or listened to with great respect) there they would themselves see that victory for

the worshipper and defeat for the enemy are assured. The Sūtra came to be respected by the royal families in Japan as well as the countries where it was handed down. Another reason why it was regarded with great respect is that it contains a chapter (XIIth, Devendra-samaya) which gives advice to royal families (Rājasāstraṃ pravakṣyāmi sarvasattvahiṭamkāraṃ XII. 1).

The earlier editions of this text are:—

- (1) Suvarṇaprabhā, First Fasc., edited for the first time by Śaratchandra Das and Śaratchandra Shāstri (Calcutta 1898, Buddhist Texts published by the Buddhist Text Society of India). This book remains incomplete.
- (2) Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra, first prepared for publication by Prof. Bunyiu Nanjio and after his death revised and edited by Hokei Idzumi, under the auspices of Keimeikwai, the Eastern Buddhist Society, Kyoto, 1931.

Prof. Nobel does not seem to have much utilized these texts, particularly the latter, while determining the readings accepted in his text. As has been already said above, the manuscripts show a great many variants as indicated by the editor in footnotes, which, by the way, contain roughly speaking, material by way of critical apparatus, three times the size of the original text. There appears to be hardly any agreement in the readings accepted by Prof. Nobel and the readings adopted by Idzumi in his edition. Wherever the manuscripts used by the editor do not point to a certain definite reading, he chooses his own on the authority of the Tibetan or Chinese translations. At times he also indicates that the reading suggested by him is uncertain, as for instance in XII. 42 *sannāramyā*. He does not seem to be taking any notice of the readings given in Idzumi's edition. In XII. 9 he accepts the reading *rājānām* (?) *sambhavam vakṣye*. He refers to the reading *nārīnām* in the footnote, but does not refer to Idzumi's reading *nārānām*. So also he has no note to discuss the reading *bālābhāryāvirodhinaḥ* of Idzumi instead of *karabhāyas tathāiva ca* in XII. 32. There is uncertainty even with regard to the exact wording of the title of the book itself. The manuscripts (BDE) give the title *Survarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtrarāja*, while the manuscripts (ACF) and the palm-leaf manuscript (G) suggest *Suvarṇa-[pra]bhāsottama-Sūtrendrarāja*. Idzumi accepts the title *Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra*. In the fragments discovered in Central Asia, it is called *Suvarṇabhāsottama*, which, according to the editor, is the original title of the book.

The whole of the text is a strange mixture of older and later material and, as has been already said above, several paragraphs and chapters have been added to the original text. Chapters II–V seem to be giving the essential teachings of the Mahāyāna School, while the remaining chapters have been added from time to time and do not form an essential or indispensable portion of the text. 'They are concerned', as Mr. Idzumi observes in the Introduction

(p. xiv) to his edition of the text, 'with the promise of various celestial beings for the special protection of the devotees, the stories of those Buddhist followers who put into practice the teachings of the Sūtra and eulogies offered by various beings celestial and demoniacal. A text composed of such diverse material is liable to be indefinitely augmented by later hands'. The Buddhist principles dilated upon in this text are in agreement with those given in other Mahāyāna books like Saddharmapundarika, Bhadracaripraṇidhāna, or Prajñāpāramitā, and readers may be referred to Idzumi's edition for the detailed information.

The first chapter tells us the advantages that accrue from the recitation of the text and we would ordinarily expect such things at the end of the text and so it is suspected to be a later addition. In the second chapter where Ruciraketu Bodhisattva raises the point as to why the life of the Buddha was limited to eighty years, when abstaining from murder (prāṇātipāta-vairamaṇam) and giving food (bhojana-pradāna) (which he both fulfilled) were considered to be sufficiently strong reasons for a very long life, we are told the Mahāyāna doctrine that the Buddha was none else but the Dharma-kāya itself (Dharma-kāyo hi Sambuddho dharmadhātus Tathāgataḥ | Idṛśo Bhagavatkāya idṛśi dharmadeśanā) and that as such he was eternal (Acintyo Bhagavān Buddho nityakāyas Tathāgataḥ). The third Chapter of the Golden Drum (Svarṇa-*duṇḍubhi*) forms as it were the kernel of the whole Sūtra. In stanzas 5, 37 and 39 we get a clue to the title of the Sūtra [Svarṇa-bhāsottama-*duṇḍubhena śāmyantu dukkhāstrisahasraloke* (5); *Svarṇabhāsottamā nāma sarvakarmakṣayamkāri* (37); *Deśayisye imāṃ deśanāṃ svarṇabhāsottamāṃ śubhāṃ* (39)]. The fourth chapter is more or less a stotra, a devotional hymn of the Buddha. The third and the fourth chapters agree with another Buddhist work of 62 stanzas called Bhadracarī (for which see Nanjio, no 1142). The fifth chapter deals with the doctrine of śūnyatā. The sixth Caturmaharājaparivarta is the longest chapter and deals with the efficacy of the Svarṇabhāsottama-sūtra, which when read or listened to with great respect has the power of dispelling enemies and the Four Mahārāja gods themselves guarantee success to the person devoted to the Sūtra. Chapters VII, VIII, X and XI are closely related to the VIth and are devoted respectively to Sarasvatī, Śrī, Ṛḍhā and the Yakṣa-Chief, Saṃjñāya, who are all equal partisans of the devotees of the Sūtra. In Chapters VII and VIII we also find the dhāraṇis reproduced from the Tibetan version. The separate existence of the IXth chapter is doubtful and some would rather join it with the preceding or the following. The XIIth chapter, as has been already pointed out above, lays down the rules of rājasāstra. The next two chapters are more or less extolatory, telling us the advantages that are derived from devotion to the Sūtra.

Strictly speaking the text seems to be ending with the XIVth chapter and a new text appears to begin with the XVth. Chapters

XV and XVII tell us how the ten thousand fishes had become gods through the kindness of Jalavāhana. In the latter there is a reference to the Mahāyāna and the Law of Causation is reproduced. Chapter XVI relates to a medical topic. Chapter XVIII tells us the story of the Great Being (Mahāsattva) sacrificing himself before a hungry tigress, that was bent upon devouring her young ones. The last Chapter XIX is again a stotra extolling the merits of the Tathāgata or the Buddha.

Like many other early Buddhist Sanskrit works such as Divyāvadāna, Lalitavistara, Mahāvastu, or Sikṣāsamuccaya, this work also seems to be based upon one in an old dialectical variation of Sanskrit and the editor suggests that the oldest document of the Sūtra betrays an interesting stage of the dialectical forms of Sanskrit and that the present Nepalese manuscripts reveal the Sanskritization on a large scale and that the earlier dialectical stages are visible only occasionally. Traces of the old Pali-Prakrit dialect may be discovered in the following examples:

Yatteṣāṃ prasṛtaṃ bhoti (I. 19); vyasanāgatā nirbhayā bhontu sarve (III. 80); dve ūrddhvagāmī dve heṣṭhagāmī (Pali heṭṭhā, V. 12); kṛtāñjalir bhūtvā śhikhitvā (Pali ṭhahitvā) rājā (XIII. 21); darṣitaṃ, supināntare (XIV. 13) supina-svabhāvāḥ (XIX. 29). Carelessness about grammatical rules also is observable as in Chap. XVII, p. 200, lines 5-6 'Ahaṃ ... tena samayena jalavāhanaḥ śreṣṭhidārako'bhūt'.

At the end of the book the editor has added valuable appendices such as a photographic reproduction of some of the pages of the palm-leaf manuscript, a section on the relation between Tib. III and Tib. IV, reproduction of stanzas 77-87 from Aṭṭhāna-jātaka, names of some of the things used in magic craft, the text of the Dhāraṇis in the Chinese transcription, last stanzas of the text as per version of Dharmakṣema, etc.

We have indeed to be very thankful to the learned editor for giving us an excellent edition of the Suvarṇabhāsottama Sūtra with all the critical apparatus that was available to him.

P. V. BAPAT.

Dharmakośa. Vol. 1, Part 1: Vyavahārakāṇḍa—Vyavahāra-mātrikā. Edited by LAXMANSHASTRI JOSHI TARKATEERTHA. Published by the Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala, Wai 1937. Pages XXXIV + 30 + 598 + 19 + 84 + 72 + 4. Size 7½" x 10½". Price Rs.16.

The history of Hinduism, as the learned editor of the Dharmakośa has justly pointed out in the Introduction (p. iv) to the first part of its first volume, which has just been published by the Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala of Wai (in the Satara District of the Province of Bombay), comprehends a detailed study of the family rites and religious usages, of the obsequial rites, of the

sacrifices, of the festivities and modes of worship, of the fasts and the pilgrimages, of the religious faiths and of the gods, of metaphysical speculations and the philosophies, of the rules governing the conduct of the individual towards the family, the caste or society, of ethics, law and politics and of all the social institutions of the Hindus. The so-called 'religious' literature of the Hindus supplies all this material and much more. The capital difficulty, however, in dealing with this conglomerate of vastly interesting matters has been that one has to collect those precious little grains of information on any single requisite point from an alarmingly massive pile of documents, at present obtainable, for the most part, in a carelessly edited and badly printed shape. Theoretically these ancient texts are of course available to anybody who wishes to consult them; but as a matter of fact, owing to the woeful lack of properly equipped libraries in India, they are not obtainable except with the greatest difficulty. Under these circumstances we cannot be sufficiently grateful to the enterprising organizers of the Dharmakośa for their laudable efforts to place in the hands of the students of the history of Indian law, ethics, sociology, religion and philosophy—in other words of Indian culture—a classified digest of this vast material in moderately priced and neatly printed volumes, surprisingly free from printing mistakes. Some idea of the extensive scope of the work and the amount of labour involved may be had from the stupendous bibliography of works consulted, numbering nearly 120 Sanskrit texts, including such encyclopædic works as the four Vedic Saṃhitās in their various recensions, together with their Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, Upaniṣads and the medieval commentaries thereon, besides the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, and quite a number of the Purāṇas, Āgamas and the Tantras! The excerpts from the original texts and the commentaries have been so arranged in this new encyclopædia of Dharma that the reader automatically finds the facts, connected with each topic successively dealt with, as far as possible chronologically arranged. As the editor has pointed out, this encyclopædia will therefore provide material for a historical study of three topics of the highest cultural value, namely: (1) social institutions; (2) political institutions; and (3) religion, ethics and philosophy, of ancient India. The material pertaining to these topics has been arranged in the following main divisions: (1) law and administration; (2) duties of the castes and the āśramas; (3) duties enjoyed in the Purāṇas and the denominational texts of the various sects; (4) expiation; (5) the discipline preparatory to final liberation; and finally (6) the sacrificial rituals.

Of the dozen or more volumes which the work will comprise, this is the first, and it deals with what is technically known as Vyavahāra, which may be rendered as jurisprudence and legal procedure. This volume is of the greatest importance for a historical study of 'the position of the individual, of the family, of

the class and the race', in the Indian society. In the days that immediately preceded the Mahomedan invasions, the Hindu legal literature, as is well known, had attained the fullest growth, and the present volume assembles in a convenient form all the available material for a close study of this voluminous literature almost in its entirety.

En passant it may be pointed out that this new Dharmakośa is going to be a real god-send for the editors of that other venerable old encyclopædia of Dharma which was known to Indian antiquity under the name of Mahābhārata, the Epic of the Bharatas, which in the guise of telling a fascinating story expounds the whole of the Hindu Dharma in all its multifarious aspects. I shall give just one illustration to show how the Dharmakośa is going to be useful to the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. When, in the course of editing of the Ādiparvan, I came across, in the Śakuntalopākhyāna, the stanza *ādityacandrāv anilānalau ca*, etc. (l. 68. 29), I had a vague impression that I had seen the stanza elsewhere, but search as I would I could not trace it. It was therefore a real surprise and pleasure to me to find in the Dharmakośa full references given to the following 18 works in which the stanza is cited, in some of which it occurs twice: Mitākṣarā, Aparārka, Vyavahāra-kalpataru, Smṛticandrikā, Parāśara-mādhava, Vyavahāra-nirṇaya, Smṛti-cintāmaṇi, Nṛsiṃhaprasāda, Divya-tattva, Sarasvatī-vilāsa, Vyavahāra-saukhyā, Vīramitrodaya, Vyavahāra-prakāśa, Vyavahāra-udyota, Vyavahāra-mayūkha, Vivādatāṇḍava, Vyavahāra-samuccaya and Agni-purāṇa. And these works show the same variant *anilo'nalaś ca* and *anilānalau ca*, with of course a sporadic transposition of *anila* and *anala*. This is an easy and straightforward stanza, which does not offer any special difficulties in point of either reading or interpretation. But there is many a stanza in the śatasāhasrī saṁhitā, which offers difficulties to both, stanzas which the late lamented Chintamanrao Vaidya was in the habit of calling kūṭaślokaś—the 8,800 ślokaś introduced by Bhagavān Vyāsa to discomfit his divine amanuensis Gaṇeśa, who had shown such unseemly hurry (Ādi, Appendix I, No. 1 footnotes)—stanzas which the late Bharatacharya could not understand and therefore thought were recondite, but which are mostly merely corrupt. In these cases it would be most useful to know the readings of the stanza in other places and the interpretations given by different commentators.

We take this opportunity to congratulate the Editorial Board of Dharmakośa on the successful production of this first part of the first volume and we trust that the organizers of the project will be well provided with the means to carry on expeditiously to completion this most valuable encyclopædia of Indian antiquities, which promises to become an indispensable work of reference to the future historian of Indian culture.

V. S. SUKTHANKAR.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Historical Geography of Sind.** Parts II and III. By M. B. Pithawala (Reprinted from the Journal of the Sind Historical Society), 1936. Pp. 42+57. Rs.2-8 each.
- Geographical Analysis of the Lower Indus Basin (Sind).** By M. B. Pithawala. Part I, Karachi, 1936. Pp. 16+73. Rs.5.
- Ayurveda-Darshanam.** By Pandit Narayandatta Tripathi. Indore, 1938. Pp. 28+365. Rs.4.
- Der Vedische Mensch.** By Dr. R. N. Dandekar. (Carl Winter, Heidelberg), 1938. Pp. 69. RM.3-80.
- Historical Selections from Baroda State Records.** Vol. IV, 1799-1813. (Baroda State Press). Pp. 8+174. Rs.1-7-0.
- Mahābhārata.** Fasc. IX Udyogaparvan (1). (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute), Poona, 1937. Pp. 400. Rs. 10-4.
- Bārāha vrata kī tip.** By Pandit Udyogasagarji, Ed. by Sri Kshamā Vijayajigani. (The Jain Ratan Printing Press, Bombay 4), 1938. Pp. 134. Rs.1-4-0.
- Pañjābī Sūfī Poets.** By Lajwanti Rama Krishna. (Oxford University Press), 1938. Pp. 32+142. Rs.5.
- Concepts of Riti and Guna in Sanskrit Poetics in their historical development.** By P. C. Lahiri. (University of Dacca), 1937. Pp. 7+310.
- Greetings to Young India.** By Benoy Kumar Sarkar. Part I, Second Edition. (N. M. Ray Chowdhury & Co., Calcutta), 1938. Pp. 21+160. Re.1.
- Deutsche im Hindukusch (Expedition, 1935).** Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Berlin, W. 35), 1937. Pp. 351.
- Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages.** Vol. II, part II: Minor Collections and Miscellaneous MSS. By G. R. Kaye and E. H. Johnston. Section I: Nos. 1-538. By Kaye. (H.M. Stationary Office, Lond.), 1937. Pp. xix+1167. Price 30s.
- Burmese Drama ; A Study.** By Maung Htin Aung. (Oxford University Press), 1937. Pp. 8+258. Price Rs.7-8-0.
- The Book of Truthfulness.** (Kitab al-Sidq). By Abu Said Al-Kharraz. Edited with translation by A. J. Arberry (Islamic Research Association No. 6). (Oxford University Press), 1937. Pp. 84+70. Price Rs.4.
- Bṛhati of Prabhakara Misra** (on the Mimamsa-sutrābhāṣya of Sabarasvamin) with the Bhāṣyapariśiṣṭa of Salikanatha (Tarkapada). Edited by S. K. Ramanatha Sastri. (Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 3, part 2) University of Madras, 1936. Pp. 1-xxxiv+68+80+25. Price Rs.2-8-0.

Die Alteste Rezension des Mahanatakam von A Esteller
(Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Leipzig.
XXI. 7), 1936. R.M. 18.

Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta. Vol. I. Critically edited by Dr.
P. L. Vaidya. (Manikchand Digambara Jaina Granthamālā,
Bombay), 1937. Pp. xlii+672. Rs.10.

Delhi: A historical Sketch. By Percival Spear, Ph.D.
(Humphrey Milford), 1937. Pp. 102. Rs.3.

TRANSLITERATION OF THE
SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ	a	औ	au	ठ	th	भ	bh
आ	ā	क	k	ड	ḍ	म	m
इ	i	ख	kh	ढ	ḍh	य	y
ई	ī	ग	g	ण	ṇ	र	r
उ	u	घ	gh	त	t	ल	l
ऊ	ū	ङ	ṅ	थ	th	व	v
ऋ	r̥	च	c	द	d	श	ś
ॠ	r̄	छ	ch	ध	dh	ष	ṣ
ऌ	l̥	ज	j	न	n	स	s
ॡ	l̄	झ	jh	प	p	ह	h
ए	e	ञ	ñ	फ	ph	ळ	ḷ
ऐ	ai	ट	ṭ	ब	b		
ओ	o						

— (Anusvāra)	m̐	× (Jihvāmūliya)	h̐
◌ (Anunāsika)	m̐	⌢ (Upadhmāniya)	h̐
: (Visarga)	h̐	₡ (Avagraha)	'

TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

ARABIC.

ا a	ز z	ق q	ـ i
ب b	س s	ك k	ـ' u
ت t	ش <i>sh</i>	ل l	اـ <i>ā</i>
ث <i>th</i>	ص s	م m	يـ <i>ī</i>
ج j	ض <i>ḍ</i>	ن n	وـ <i>ū</i>
ح <i>h</i>	ط <i>t</i>	و w	ى ai, ay
خ <i>kh</i>	ظ <i>ẓ</i>	ه <i>h</i>	وـ au, aw
د <i>d</i>	ع 'ـ	ي y	silent t <i>ḥ</i>
ذ <i>dh</i>	غ <i>gh</i>	ـ' 'ـ	
ر r	ف f	ـ a	

PERSIAN.

پ p	چ <i>ch</i>	ژ <i>zh</i>	گ g
---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	---------------

